PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Association of History Teachers

OF THE

Middle States and Maryland

LIBRARY OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA COLLEGE
FOR WOMEN
1931

Number 28 **1930**

Some Objectives of Social Science Teaching — *C. J. H. Hayes*

Condorcet, The Career of a Philosophe — *J. S. Schapiro*

The Vanished Naturalist — *D. R. Fox*

MEETINGS

NEW YORK ATLANTIC CITY

Price One Dollar

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

Association of History Teachers

OF THE

Middle States and Maryland

Number 28 **1930**

Some Objectives of Social Science Teaching — *C. J. H. Hayes*

Condorcet, The Career of a Philosophe — *J. S. Schapiro*

The Vanished Naturalist — *D. R. Fox*

MEETINGS

NEW YORK ATLANTIC CITY

Price One Dollar

CONTENTS

		Page
New York Meeting, May 9–10, 1930		1
I.	Social Science Courses in Washington, D. C., *Miss Suzanne B. Waters*	2
II.	Some Significant Activities in the Teaching of Social Studies in the Secondary Schools of Baltimore, *Miss Lillian Donovan*	10
III.	An attempt to Individualize Instruction in Social Studies at South Philadelphia High School for Girls, *Miss Anna L. Stern*	16
IV.	A New Syllabus in Modern European History for New York City, *Mr. Augustus S. Beatman*	23
V.	Condorset, The Career of a Philosophe during the French Revolution, *Professor J. Salwyn Schapiro*	28
VI.	Some Objectives of Social Science Teaching, *Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes*	48
VII.	The Vanished Naturalist, *Professor Dixon Ryan Fox*	58
Atlantic City Meeting, November 29, 1930		68
VIII.	Experimentation in Testing in the Social Studies: Some Problems and Implications, *Mr. W. G. Kimmel*	69
IX.	Exercises in the Use of Historical Evidence, *Marion G. Clarke*	90
X.	Report on Referendum	112
XI.	Treasurer's Report for 1929–1930	117
XII.	Report of Members	118
XIII.	Constitution	119
XIV.	Subscribing Libraries	121
XV.	List of Council Members	123
XVI.	List of Members	124

NEW YORK MEETING

May 9-10, 1930

Friday Afternoon, May 9, 3:30 o'clock, The Auditorium, Casa Italiana, Columbia University.

GENERAL TOPIC: *"Some Significant Novelties in Teaching Social Studies in Certain Urban Centers."*

a. *Washington:* Miss Suzanne B. Waters, Macfarland Junior High School.

b. *Baltimore:* Miss Lillian Donovan, Eastern High School.

c. *Philadelphia:* Miss Anna L. Stern, South Philadelphia High School for Girls.

d. *New York:* Mr. Augustus S. Beatman, Julia Richman High School.

Friday Evening, May 9, 7:00 o'clock, The Faculty Club, Columbia University.

ADDRESS: *"Internationalism and the Teaching of History"*, Dr. Eileen Power, London School of Economics.

Saturday Morning, May 10, 10:30 o'clock, The Auditorium, Casa Italiana, Columbia University.

ADDRESSES:

a. *"The London Naval Conference and Its Significance"*, Dr. Raymond Leslie Buell, Research Director, Foreign Policy Association.

b. *"Condorset, the Career of a Philosophe during the French Revolution"*, Professor J. Salwyn Schapiro, College of the City of New York.

c. *"Some Objectives of Social Science Teaching"*, Professor Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University.

Saturday Afternoon, May 10, 1:00 o'clock, The Faculty Club, Columbia University.

ADDRESS: *"Social Aspects of American History"*, Professor Dixon Ryan Fox, Columbia University, President of New York State Historical Association.

SOCIAL SCIENCE COURSES IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

The report of the Committee of Seven (1898) was the guiding force that shaped high school courses up to the year 1916, at which time the influential N. E. A. committee reported. This 1916 committee was the first committee with nation-wide influence to take into consideration the junior high school organization. In 1921 the second Committee of Eight made its report. This report and the N. E. A. recommendations of 1916 were carefully studied by committees of teachers in Washington; our junior and senior high school courses were established as they exist today as a result of this study.

Social science courses should be based upon recommendations or reports of committees representing social science organizations with membership throughout the country. This does not mean that the courses must be patterned exactly after such recommendations. These recommendations are intended to be guides to bring about improvement and some degree of uniformity in social science teaching in the United States. A factory city like Gary, Indiana, would probably give emphasis to certain social science courses which might well be given a minimum treatment in a residential city like Washington. Social science courses in business or technical schools might likewise be different from the courses in academic schools. There are many local reasons why the full program of a national committee cannot be carried out. The opposition of other departments in a school system is often strong. When American history was made in Washington a required subject in the senior high schools, open to third- as well as to fourth-year students the science department protested most strenuously, as it was feared that this would reduce the number of students electing third year science. When the time given to ninth grade ancient history was reduced from one year to one semester the Latin department protested, declaring that students taking second year Latin would not be properly prepared by the history department with the background necessary for studying Caesar.

In 1908, when I began work in Washington, four years of history were offered in the academic senior high schools,—none was required. Civics and economics as semester subjects were also offered to seniors. These courses, without doubt, were based upon the study of the recommendations of the Committee of Seven (1898). This committee recommended four years of history—

Ancient history to 800 A. D. ..... for 9th grade
Medieval and modern history ..... for 10th grade
English history ..... for 11th grade
American history and civil government .... for 12th grade

As stated, the courses here were based upon the study of the recommendations of the Committee of Seven; they were not exactly patterned after these recommendations. In Washington, the courses offered in 1908 were as follows—

Ancient history to 800 A. D. ..... for 9th grade
Medieval history with emphasis on
English history ..... for 10th grade
Modern history with emphasis on English
history ..... for 11th grade
American history ..... for 12th grade
also
Civics and economics ..... for 12th grade

In 1916, the N. E. A. Committee made recommendations which had immediate results throughout the country. This was the first national committee to make recommendations for social science studies in junior high schools; it also made recommendations for senior high school courses. The recommendations for senior high schools, only, were studied here at that time for the reason that there were no junior high schools in Washington.

There was considerable dissatisfaction with our program offering four years of history; parents, teachers, and students were critical. There was a strong feeling that the courses were out of proportion; a full year given to medieval history was thought altogether too much and many people also questioned the wisdom of devoting a year to ancient history. The students who elected American

history were largely girls who planned to enter the normal school; one year, only three boys elected the course in American history in the Central High School. Teachers of senior civics and economics complained because their students lacked the background of a good course in high school American history.

A round table conference was arranged between the teachers of social science and the chairman and secretary of the N. E. A. Committee of 1916, Dr. T. Jesse Jones and Mr. Arthur Dunn. This committee had recommended the following—

Political, economic and vocational civics
.....for the 9th grade
World history .....for the 10th grade
American history .....for the 11th grade
Problems of American democracy ....for the 12th grade

The four year course in history recommended by the Committee of Seven, as you will note, was crowded from below by "community civics" and from above by "problems in American democracy".

The round table conference proved most interesting and valuable. The teachers of Washington, however, were decided in their views—

1st. That the so-called "community civics" was not well defined: that such a course in the ninth grade would differ very little from the civics that was taught in the eighth grade; that the course in civics should continue to be taught in the twelfth grade where it could be made a course distinctly different from eighth grade civics.

2nd. That the reduction of our three year course in world history (ancient 1st year, medieval 2d year, modern 3d year) to a one year course in world history was altogether too radical; it would make the course too much like a mere outline.

3d. That the course in American history, properly taught, is *in fact* a course in the *problems* of *American democracy;* and therefore that our senior courses in civics and economics be continued in which *principles* should be emphasized.

I might state here that the method of history teaching, which has been so universal, in which students have been forced to remember thousands of facts rather than to *think* has placed history teachers very much on the defensive, particularly since 1916. This method

of history teaching, in my opinion, more than anything else, opened the way for the N. E. A. committee to recommend two years of history rather than four years as recommended by earlier national committees.

There are influential leaders in social science who appear to be convinced that history teachers will not make good; that they will not make history vital. They seem resolved to reduce the teaching of history to a minimum, replacing history with other social studies. Personally, I believe that every course in history can be made vital; that improvements in teaching can be made within the history courses; that it is unnecessary to replace the courses we now have with other subjects. Everything desired to be done through these newer courses can be equally well or, in fact, better accomplished through history courses.

After weeks of consideration and discussion of the N. E. A. report of 1916, the courses in the Washington senior high schools were established as follows—

Ancient and medieval history with emphasis on English history in the medieval course (elective) ..... 9th grade
Modern history with emphasis on English history (elective) .....10th grade
American history and the Constitution (required) .....11th grade or 12th grade
Civics and economics, each a semester (elective).....12th grade

Under this program the amount of time given to modern and American history remained the same; the time devoted to ancient history and medieval history was reduced fifty per cent; American history was required.

The first Washington junior high school was finally organized. There existed at that time what we considered two good guides to follow in determining what should be done in junior high school social science—

1st — The N. E. A. report of 1916.
2d — The Second Committee of Eight (American Historical Assoc.)

We studied the N. E. A. report and, since the Second Committee of Eight had an office in Washington, we consulted its chairman and secretary, Dr. Schafer and Dr. Knowlton. Both committees recommended European history and geography for the seventh grade. The Second Committee of Eight emphasized the need of teaching junior high school American history in its world setting, so that pupils would get the history of their own country in proper perspective.

Both committees recommended the early European background for the seventh grade. In Washington, the early European background is taught in grades below the seventh. Our task was to build upon what had already been taught prior to the seventh grade. Junior high schools should not dictate courses for grades below the seventh; nor should the senior high schools dictate to the junior high schools, nor the colleges to senior high schools.

Members of the Second Committee of Eight (1921) suggested the interweaving of geography, civics, and modern world history throughout the American history course.

The interweaving of geography was accomplished by giving three days each week to history and two days to geography. If history teachers were also geography teachers much better co-ordination would result; the geography lessons of a given week could apply to the countries or sections under discussion in history classes.

The interweaving of civics and American history as suggested by members of the Second Committee of Eight was also adopted here. When American history classes in the eighth grade reach the point where they study the Constitutional Convention they lay aside their history texts and for nine weeks study the Constitution, using Rexford and Carson's text on the Constitution. The eighth grade course of study in American history makes constant reference to the Constitution throughout. This same plan is followed in the senior high school American history course.

The task of interweaving the modern world setting for American history throughout the American history course was a real problem; seventh grade teachers, generally, are not students of modern history; American history texts do not provide proper material for this course. The situation here was discussed with the chairman and the secretary of the Second Committee of Eight and it

was decided to build up a course in the modern world setting for grade 7a, the earlier background for American history being left to the grades below the seventh where it already existed. Modern history, particularly European, if taught in the usual manner, is very complicated and would be far too difficult for seventh grade pupils. It was decided to build up the 7a course through a study of the lives and work of great men and women of modern times; the characters chosen for study were selected with the help of the chairman and the secretary of the Second Committee of Eight. It was the task of several years to provide the material for study needed by pupils in this 7a work. This material, now in textbook form, interests the pupils in great modern characters and attempts to show how each character influenced civilization.

I wish to state that the courses in social sciences in the junior high schools of Washington were outlined by committees of teachers who considered national committee reports, local needs and coordination with grades below the seventh and with grades above the ninth. I served merely in an advisory capacity on these committees. The courses in the senior high schools had been outlined earlier after the views of all social science teachers in the senior high schools were obtained.

It will be of interest to you to learn, if you do not already know, that, although the work of the Second Committee of Eight (1921) was thorough, and its report widely circulated and influential, yet its report has never been authorized as a recommendation for courses by the American Historical Association. That association, composed largely of history professors, took the view, I understand, that the Second Committee of Eight had permitted itself to be too much influenced by the report of the N. E. A. Committee of 1916. The Second Committee of Eight had apparently given too much recognition to such courses as 9th grade "community civics" and 12th grade "problems in American democracy" to suit the professors of history in the American Historical Association.

The courses in this city, 7th to 12th grades, inclusive, are based upon a *study* of the reports of the last two national committees. We have not exactly patterned our courses after their recommendations, yet these two committee reports have been our guides. The 12th year courses in advanced civics and economics have con-

tinued the same since 1908; the Second Committee of Eight (1921) emphasized the value of teaching the *principles* as well as the problems. I have been told by good authority that during the past few years there has been a decided drift from the N. E. A. (1916) course in problems of American democracy back to the courses in civics and economics. The course in problems of American democracy has no place in the curriculum when American history is properly taught as a course in the problems of our country.

If students entering the 9th grade of a junior high school do not plan to complete senior high school work they elect the semester course which is offered in "community civics". After years of experimentation we found sufficient worth—while content for a semester's study in this course. It is far better for students who leave school for work after graduating from junior high schools to study community and national activities than to study about the ancient Greeks and Romans. If students entering the ninth grade of a junior high school plan to graduate from a senior high school, they can elect the course in early European history.

Thus, in the junior high schools for those who plan to leave school after graduation we have a cycle,

1st European history .....7a grade
2d American history and the Constitution {(7b grade / (8th grade
3d The study of political and economic life, 9th grade

For senior high school students we have a similar cycle,

1st European history
2d American history and the Constitution
3d The study of political and economic life

Certain colleges demand a full year of ancient history as an entrance requirement. To meet the needs of the few students who plan to enter these colleges the Washington senior high schools offer twelfth year students a semester of advanced ancient history; this course, together with the semester of ancient history offered in the ninth year, makes a full year of ancient history. This course offered seniors in advanced ancient history is also a good preparation for those students who plan to take the college entrance examination in ancient history.

In conclusion I wish to emphasize the danger that accompanies sweeping and far reaching changes in social science courses: "jewels may be thrown into the rubbish pile never to be recovered." We have, without doubt, able leaders in the social science field today, yet they are no more capable than those who led in our field in years gone by. Let us build gradually and improve on what has already been done. There is no "cure all" in the social sciences nor in any other field. An innovation applied to an entire school system is always dangerous; if tried out, let it be done in a small experimental way. Experiments on a small scale, if conducted by superior teachers, *may* yield something of value.

George J. Jones

SOME SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITIES IN THE TEACHING OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOLS OF BALTIMORE

We, the teachers, are constantly challenged by educators with the statement that what we lack in America in education is a philosophy that has a bigger and finer vision of what education ought to do. If unrest is a characteristic stage of progress, we are on the verge of better conditions, for teachers are thinking deeply and striving valiantly to discern how much uniformity and how much individuality must enter into the education of students who will have to adjust themselves to a rapidly changing world. In fact, we have arrived at a period when the majority of teachers have an experimental attitude toward their work and are guided in the adjustment of material to the needs of a class.

In the intelligent consideration of the situation we know that the development of proper habits is one of our objectives; the habits of every individual must be watched and guided; more exactly, the habit response of every individual to the whole situation demands analysis and understanding before intelligent guidance can be given.

In Baltimore, as in other places, study in all of its aspects and in its fullest meaning is engaging wide attention, and experiments have been made to develop a technique that gives desired values. An analysis of study activities that enter into home assignments is being made with the idea of preparing a statement of the best technique of independent study for the use of pupils. Commercial work-books of various kinds have been tried in individual classes and guide sheets compiled by groups of teachers or by individuals and used in mimeographed form have given a degree of satisfaction. One value that has accrued from the preparation of guide sheets has been the insight and understanding that have come from the evaluation of the material for the purpose. It has been the policy of the school administration to develop courses of study, to provide for their interpretation and adjustment,

and to study technique on a co-operative basis, realizing that the most significant outcome from such a procedure is not the finished product, but the valuable training that comes from the preparation, and, also, realizing that the value is directly proportional to the number of persons interested in the activity.

The unit plan of studying history is the approved one in the Baltimore schools as it not only provides the surest way of gaining our objectives but involves the wide use of a variety of materials and wide reading activities which help to solve the problem of individualization. In the preparation of our course of study we selected our topics with much care, but then with our strong predilection for the facts that we had learned in our own school experience and which to most of us have a peculiar sanctity, we gave a detailed outline under each of the topics. It was soon discovered that there was a better way and we concentrated on a study of the tentative outcomes of each topic. All teachers of 7B work met and discussed, *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary Schools* by Morrison and tried to think in terms of "basic understandings". Each topic was taken under consideration and the following items commonly agreed upon: generalizations, a suggested schedule of lessons, the problems that "help to fix the attention on the understandings,"[1] the various materials, textual and graphic, activities that aid in the development, and the objectives in knowledge, habits and skills, and appreciation. Under knowledge were included events, personalities, dates, historical vocabulary, quotations. Habits and skills for the year were arranged in a series and the continuation or initiation of each one provided for in connection with the topic or topics best suited to the purpose; appreciations were also the result of common agreement. The outcomes selected in all lines were to be considered as a minimum in setting promotional standards, but experiment proved that we were too ambitious. Here, as has been said before, the greatest value was in the clearer insight and consciousness of real purpose which came to the teachers from the study. It revealed possibilities and gave direction to the adjustments of material that had to be made to meet the varying capacities of classes and of individuals. In fact, it gave a control of subject matter that is an essential basis for effective teaching—

[1]Morrison, H., Practice of Teaching in the Secondary Schools.

the control that harmonizes practice with the student's need. A final step was the compilation of a practice test and a review test on each topic. The 7A assignment was worked out in the same way, but 8B and 8A assignments were developed as directive guide sheets on each topic. The desired habits to be practiced and developed in that grade work were considered carefully in preparing the directive activities and problems. A study of objectives in the senior high school work is now under way in the various senior high schools, each school working on a report. From all of these a composite one for the city will be formulated.

The most extensive as well as the most scientific experiment in the Social Studies in Baltimore was one conducted by Dr. Angela Broening in the geography work of the seventh and eighth grades. Here the idea of individualization and forms of directed study have been tried out and adjusted to local conditions. With the cooperation of all the geography teachers in the Junior High School, Dr. Broening prepared a course of study with practice tests, self-administered and self-scored by the pupils, and objective achievement tests on each unit. To help spur the pupils to greater progress and place responsibility, a Laboratory Progress Graph is posted by the teacher on the bulletin board of each class and the weekly progress of each student recorded thereon, and an Individual Geography Progress Card is kept by each student. On this he "records for himself the amount he accomplishes each period in the laboratory and at home." The contracts were developed after several years of study of the various plans of individualizing instruction and two years of experimentation under local conditions. They are now in printed form and are being assembled into booklets under Miss Josie Strea, the Supervisor of Geography.

"The plan is based on these five propositions:

1. Individual differences of pupils and teachers are permanent factors in the teaching-learning situation.
2. A knowledge of the goal and stimulus of right incentives facilitate learning.
3. Potentialities are children's inheritance, their development being affected by many things, including conscious education.

4. Emotionalized learning is more enjoyable and permanent than that entirely intellectualized.
5. Every subject has certain facts and principles which are fundamental to a child's adequate adjustment to his social environment. His rate of mastering these is a factor controlled by his individual learning capacity, interests, and habits."[2]

One outstanding accomplishment in the geography department has been the development of well-equipped laboratories with an abundance of materials of many kinds.

Perhaps a "significant novelty" might be our consideration of source material in connection with the history of the Junior High School. We were somewhat fearful when Dr. Henry Johnson, our adviser on the Course of study in History, suggested the inclusion of some original material. I think we now have accepted, after some use, the thesis of Professor Johnson that "schoolroom history should give the student some consciousness of what historical knowledge is and some training in the method by which historical knowledge is established."[2] The particular source problems included in the course of study have served more as an incentive to teachers to consider source material than as the ones to be used, for the best selection is determined by the experience of a teacher and by a question that arises in a classroom.

In using more than one text, or one text and reference books, a variance in statement sometimes occurs. The following instance will serve as an illustration: The members of a class were discussing the land policy of the United States, and brought two interpretations of the Homestead Law. Each group was sure of its reference and of the statement made. The point raised was whether the land secured under the Homestead Act was free except for fees incident to recording and transfer, or whether there was a charge of $1.25 an acre. It was finally decided that the act would have to be consulted. The debated point was cleared up by the explanation that the period of residence to secure title could be commuted for purchase on the basis of pre-emption.

[2]Individualizing Geography Instruction, Supplement No. 1 to Course of Study in Geography, for Junior High Schools, City of Baltimore Department of Education.

Discussions of this type occur frequently enough to give a notion of how much research and analysis precedes the acceptance of facts before they can be organized into history. The enthusiasm that usually accompanies such a difference of opinion gives a zest to the library activity and creates a favorable attitude toward sifting the point to the truth. Quoting again from Dr. Johnson, "The greater part of school history must be presented as ready-made information, but there should be illustrations of the historical method sufficient to indicate the general nature of the problems behind organized history, and sufficient to give training in the solution of such problems."[1] This would seem to indicate that the planning of definite problems is a desirable procedure. A problem such as, "How was the northern boundary of the United States fixed?" leads to the use of various treaties. In the study to secure the various facts needed and the organization of the material, a clearer conception is gained of how history is made.

We have found that source extracts often help to motivate or to contribute to what might be called the "movement" of a unit in a most satisfactory manner. The exact statements of Washington, and other leaders after the battle of Lexington give a force to the early purposes of the patriots that no mere statements of words can give, and the resolutions of the various colonial assemblies emphasize the feeling of the public on the question of separation from England, and create an interest and enthusiasm that stimulate a search for the reasons that brought about the change. In caring for individual differences, whether for home assignment or as assimulative material for use in directed study periods, source material, well selected and suited to specific purposes, is prepared by teachers and mimeographed. This work is sometimes done by the students in the commercial classes. Sometimes the sheets contain questions designed to guide the students in the interpretation.

In our Junior High schools, where we do not have promotion by subject, it sometimes happens that students repeat history because of failure in other subjects. This is an opportunity to make a wider use of source material.

In teaching the topic of "Expansion" there are fine opportunities. For instance, to develop the sub-topic, "the acquisition of Louisiana",

---

[1]Johnson, Henry, The Teaching of History.

we have used (1) the treaty transferring the territory to the United States, (2) the letter to Lewis commissioning him to explore the territory, and (3) diaries of the explorers. All of these help to give more complete understanding and realism to the topic. Some reviews have been worked out in the form of dramatization, and, here again, the topic, "Expansion" has lent itself admirably to this type of work.

Committees of pupils were responsible for each acquisition, and each committee used source material in preparing its particular episode in as dramatic a form as possible. The compromise of 1850 was prepared in a similar way. On occasions when the history department has been responsible for assembly periods, the committee has compiled some of its work from original records consulted at the Maryland Historical Society rooms. Programs for *Peggy Stewart Day, Constitution and Navy Day,* and *Maryland Day* have been developed in this manner.

Material has been collected by teachers through the co-operation of the homes, letters of Civil War days, old newspapers, old deeds, and the like are brought by pupils and, when possible, copies are made. Source booklets containing data of various kinds on current happenings of importance, the Pan-American Conference in Havana, the Washington Conference, the inauguration of a president are prepared and filed in the library for future classes.

The contact with original sources has not only been helpful to pupils but has had a "salutary effect" as well on those teachers who have found time to use it. We have had only a glimpse of its possibilities, but more thoughtful use and planning, I am sure, would yield added stimulation and enthusiasm, and would create an attitude of discrimination that would "reject the printed page as an evidence of truth" and lay the foundation for a better understanding of the historical method.

LILLIAN DONOVAN

AN ATTEMPT TO INDIVIDUALIZE INSTRUCTION IN SOCIAL STUDIES AT SOUTH PHILADELPHIA HIGH SCHOOL FOR GIRLS

South Philadelphia girls have their limitations as well as their charms. Eighty percent come from homes where English is not the daily speech, and thus they have small vocabularies and very sketchy informational backgrounds. In addition to this the I. Q. mean of our entering group is the lowest in the city. The city mean is usually about 103 and ours is 90. This difference has occurred for a number of years. The fact that an I. Q. of 100 is generally accepted as necessary for High School work gives you an idea of what our problem is.

We realized there were two rather destructive ways of meeting our problem. The first was to let the average or bright girls set the standard and thus eliminate the slower ones. The second was to lower the standards. Both were inconceivable: the first was wasteful and disheartening in that girls spent two or three years in high school and had no training commensurate with their ability to show for it; the second was even worse because, since so few good girls really work up to the limit of their ability in high schools where the student body is of average intelligence or higher, to inculcate still greater habits of laziness was unthinkable. As we had already experimented with the idea of adapting work to the average and bright pupil in our Dalton Guide Sheets, we decided that a really well worked out scheme of adaptation might help us with our problem.

At the present time we are offering four distinctly different types of work. The first is a one year extension course which only those girls who would never be able to graduate from high school are permitted to take. The second is what we call "History II" or Slow History; this parallels the prescribed Philadelphia course, the difference lying in the type of text used and the amount of material covered. The third is the kind of history one would give to average girls capable of being certificated for normal school or

college. The fourth group is a subdivision of our average or bright group. It is composed of exceptional girls who are given training in responsibility and in using their tools independently.

Admission to the extension group is determined by our school psychologist. She bases her decisions upon the girls' school achievement or rather their lack of it, their age (we do not let them take this course unless they will have reached the age of sixteen at the end of their year's work) and their I. Q. Great care is taken to see that only girls of low mental age are put into this group. We do not want any lazy, average girl to think this a high school short-cut.

The vocational aim of the course is to train the girls to do filing, typing and to be of assistance in an office. Since one of the claims of the Social Science group is that it trains for citizenship, obviously this group needed some social studies, but what kind? We ruled out history because with their limited mentality nothing could be accomplished except a mere recital of memorized facts and we doubted whether this functioned after the recitation was over. We decided instead to give them very elementary sociology in which problems that involved their lives were discussed. This year the first term's work has centered about the family and the home, while the second has centered about the job with its attendant problems, child labor, factory inspection, minimum wage, etc. This group meets three times a week and does practically all its work by supervised study. We use no formal text here; instead we select material which can be understood by our extension groups. The girls seem to enjoy their work; they are contented and interested and they get joy out of gaining virtual mastery over some facts and material. Before they enter this course a great many are continual truants; this almost never occurs after they join the extension group.

Our second group takes Slow History or "History II". This group is composed of those who by consistent effort may graduate from high school but will probably never get good enough records to be certificated for normal school or college. To this class the High School History text is a bugbear; the words are beyond their vocabulary and there are not enough actual word pictures to hold their interest, so that in our regular classes they are at a loss. In order to determine what girls belong to this group we give the entering class the Monroe silent reading test. Those who fall

below the Monroe standard median of 26 are put into "History II". If we find that they do much better than the average here we shift them to Rapid History. In the slow course we parallel the curriculum used in most High Schools,—European History in the 10th year and American in the 11th; the difference lies in the treatment of material. Using a Junior High School text as a basis we have worked out very explicit assignments; the sheet is really a tool,—one that is extremely necessary. It aims to teach them how to hunt facts on the printed page and how to put these facts in their note books. The class sets its own pace and emphasis is placed upon habits of study and exactness rather than upon the amount of material covered.

For the girls in this class who do satisfactory work, we give some elective reading. This varies according to the type of minimum material treated, but it usually takes the form of biographical reading material on social life and customs, and certain historical novels. Examples of the kind of books used in elective reading are: Tappan, *When Knights were Bold;* Davis, *The Friar of Wittenberg;* Major, *When Knighthood was in Flower.* No girl who does not do elective reading can get more than F+ and no girl in this course can make a grade higher than G.

Our third group—the "History I" group—is composed of those who can do from fair to excellent high school work. In most schools this is the larger group, but not in ours. Since our reading ability median is so low,—23 instead of 26,—we have a smaller number of girls in "History I". These girls use High School texts. Guide sheets are given them to help organize their material. We feel these monthly sheets are very helpful because they state what we consider the essential points without outlining in such detail as to be a crutch; they save a great amount of time in assigning lessons and they impress upon the girls' minds the continuity of history. Except for the first month practically no supervised study is given here unless we have an exceptional case.

Girls who do G work in this group may add electives. No Girl is graded more than G, no matter what quality of her work, unless she does some elective or collateral reading. We vary our elective work a great deal in order to create interest and to give the girls the type of work they want and need. One type of elective given is the informational,—this rounds out the conference work.

Many girls like this because they feel either that the detail given in their text is inadequate or they want material from a different viewpoint. American History texts are necessarily inadequate in their discussion of big business, the tariff and the Federal Reserve system, so some material from the viewpoint of economics is valuable here. Just yesterday one of my girls said, "The trouble with text books is that they don't go into enough detail; they don't always show how facts are related. The other day in the library I read that the Sherman Silver Purchase Act and the McKinley Tariff were passed by vote trading. I think that's awfully important. It shows the kind of Congress we had and how sectional interests can put across bad legislation." I felt that, for a sixteen year old, this showed a good amount of discrimination.

To train the objective point of view we offer electives that portray the life and thought of the period. These range from the quasi-popular type, Mark Sullivan's *Our Times*, to the controversial type which detail different opinions on slavery, the Revolutionary War, imperialism and many other topics. Even though our girls come from foreign homes they have the one hundred per cent American complex; especially do they have the Northern viewpoint in considering the Civil War, so source material on this topic is stimulating and helpful in developing their ability to discriminate and to view history from the standards of the group that made it. The series called *A History of American Life*, edited by Schlesinger and Fox, has proved very helpful in formulating electives of the social type.

Biography is another elective offered. Our girls differ greatly in their attitude toward these. One of my girls was so thrilled by "From Immigrant to Inventor" that she arranged a special conference of interested girls in order that she might tell them about it. "I told my father all about it, too!" she confided to me. Two other girls, whom I urged to try it found it so uninteresting that they gave it up in disgust. We try to inculcate this type of reading, because, in our optimistic moments, we hope that this taste will carry over to their post high school years.

We use magazine articles wherever possible, because most of our girls have no good periodicals in their homes, and we wish to impress upon them the joy they can get from reading these.

Splendid articles are constantly appearing: *The Tariff and Self Interest* in the Winter Century and *If Ramsay MacDonald Were an American* in Harpers, February 1930 are examples of the kind we use.

Girls may, with the approval of their teacher, formulate their own electives. This happens quite frequently. Once I had a freshman who asked to be excused from doing electives on the Renaissance in order that she might read Dante's *The Divine Comedy*. This was the most unusual substitution I have ever had. Just last week I was helping this girl prepare for a competitive scholarship examination. "Susie", I asked, "Have you ever read Dante?" "Don't you remember when I read it before?" she replied, "I still read it; when I am blue it makes me happy; when I'm bored it makes me interested."

These electives and their texts furnish plenty of material for historical criticism. We feel that no average or good girl should complete her history course unless she has some conception of difficulties involved in writing authentic History and some knowledge of the literature of History. The group that gets the best training in this is our fourth distinct classification;—the honors students.

This group is really the cream of our school; no girl may be a member unless she has been recommended by all her teachers. One of the privileges of honor girls is to select a field in which they wish to do research work. They must do it for one year. In our department they may do their work in either American History or Social Problems. We talk over with the group the possibilities offered and then the girls select what they wish to do. In Social Science the work is a group project. A term is spent in gaining theoretical and practical knowledge about such problems as "crime and punishment" or "feeblemindedness". Each girl is responsible for one phase of the work and she reports her findings to the group.

In American History there is such a divergence of interest that group work is not generally used; the girls either formulate their own topics or pick them from a list given by the teachers. Examples of these are: The Monroe Doctrine 1823–1930, a topic in which they take great pleasure; Westward Expansion; the Confederate States; A comparison of the English and American Systems of Government. Occasionally an American History

honors group wishes to function as such; one did in a beginning class a couple terms ago when it compared English, French and Spanish colonization in America.

The problem of collecting, selecting, and organizing their material is left to the girls. Their weekly electives have already provided some training in how to hunt and organize material, and with this as a basis, they start. At first, group conferences are held because many of their problems are common ones, and the same advice helps two or three girls. Occasionally one girl can solve another girl's perplexities. As they progress and their work becomes more differentiated, individual conferences are necessary. In American History, the work is always handed in in the form of a thesis, with a carefully arranged bibliography and more or less carefully arranged footnotes. Whenever I receive my Juniors American History honors work, I am overcome by both pride and chagrin; pride in their achievement,—because some of these papers are quite scholarly and fine; chagrin in the knowledge that my own Freshman History paper in college had a so much poorer bibliography.

Notwithstanding the good papers they produce, I doubt whether this is the sole advantage of the honors group. Its great achievement is, I think, that it puts girls absolutely on their own, and thus develops their initiative and responsibility. Girls who go on to college and normal school are quick to feel this, and, without any urging, they come back to tell us how their training has functioned.

So I have taken you from our "lowest to our highest." Development of responsibility is necessary for right living, and we feel that the development of this is the chief aim of the Dalton Plan. We have tried to develop this sense with all our groups. As the mental quality and the age of the girls increase we have given them greater freedom of thought and action by adapting their work to them. Our girls seem to appreciate this fact because they are actively interested and happy.

Our girls also recognize that they are individuals and that they differ because of this. They calmly accept the grouping, in fact, they assist us in it. If, through a roster mistake, they are placed in the wrong group, they are very quick to point out that fact. I have heard many girls say that they were in the rapid history group but in the slow stenography group, or vice versa and they

realized the reason. Certainly the poise and emotional stability of the slower ones are better developed than when they were attempting to do work beyond their ability. The more rapid students do better work, for, when the medicore ones no longer set the pace we can demand more, both in quantity and quality.

Anna Louise Sterns

NEW SYLLABUS IN MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY FOR NEW YORK CITY

Under the New York Regents' System, it is possible for a local community to attempt to work out its own solution for a particular problem. A year ago last fall, a committee was appointed to prepare a new syllabus in Modern European History for New York City. Several influences were responsible for this.

First, we felt the pressure from the lower grade pupils brought into the high schools by the Continuation School Law. Not all the pupils with an I. Q. of 90 or below are in Philadelphia.

Second, there was the pressure from the tremendous accumulation of material. All we had to do was glance over in memory what was the content of European History when we were in college to realize the tremendous accumulation of new ideas and new movements that could not be ignored—that meant increased work.

Third, there were circumstances which arose because a great number of teachers were not making any great selection to meet that difficulty but simply adding more and more facts instead of seeing to the digestion of those already covered.

When the Committee was organized, we asked ourselves the question "What are those factors, influences, movements which make the modern world modern? What is there in this modern world which must be included?" We had certain clear ideas of what must be there. There must be an understanding of how the Industrial Revolution and the growth of science had changed things. We cannot ignore the effect and force of nationalism, that nationalism which acts as a force in the building up of some states and in the breaking down of others; that nationalism which is at the root of so many modern problems and conflicts. We can not neglect this imperialism which stretches around the world and is of a somewhat different character from the older imperialism. We can not neglect the fact that there is a new sense of the horror of war, some determination to do away with it, and some attempt to so organize the higher spiritual forces and ideals that there is machinery to attempt to harness war and to spread peace.

Then there was in some quarters the feeling that history should be broadened out to bring in what is ordinarily spoken of as the cultural achievements of mankind. To some it seemed inconsistent that we should look back on the Greeks and consider their greatest achievement in history to be along cultural lines and pay no attention to cultural developments in the modern world. They felt there ought to be some attempt made to bring about a realization that literature, art, architecture, painting and music have developed in modern times.

Then there was a belief that social movements like the relation of church and state, the advances in education and the growth of toleration should not be neglected.

Modern agriculture has certain distinct features and has developed in a revolution of its own. The Labor Movement has had such tremendous effects that it certainly should be treated with the problems growing out of the Industrial Revolution.

These were things which could not be rejected but we also felt that you could not jump into consideration of those without some idea of what the world was in 1750 (our job being to teach occurrences since 1750). Again there could not be a cross section of European History in 1750, disregarding the fact that the world had been developing for a considerable number of years before that time.

We decided to organize the syllabus into units as follows: Unit I, background. We wrote out in something like fifteen or sixteen pages what we considered to be the most essential milestones up to 1750, with the idea that there should be simply a look back on it. We recommended that this part of the Syllabus be stencilled and put in the hands of pupils to be gone over in the first week of the term, not as something to be taught but to put them in touch with the past. Unit II, a cross section of Europe in 1750; Unit III, the French Revolution; Unit IV, the Industrial Revolution; Unit V, Labor Movement; Unit VI, Agricultural Revolution; Unit VII, Science; Unit VIII, Growth of Nationalism; Unit IX, Growth of Democracy; Unit X, Imperialism; Unit XI, Development of Literature, etc.; Unit XII, World War; Unit XIII, Growth of the Peace Movement; Unit XIV, Some Social Developments, and Unit XV, a Cross Section of Europe today.

A cross section gave the view of the world about 1750 and how it was overturned in the French Revolution. After the most

essential of modern developments had been topically treated, the World War gave another sort of cross section, tying up from all of the previous movements those features that had led up to the World War. After the peace movement and social movements, there is a summary which puts the world of today in contrast with the world of 1750.

Another thing was the idea that there should be some real comprehension of each force in our modern life, not a memorizing of facts or a memorizing of generalizations. The grasp of the forces which are playing back and forth in the modern conditions of today should come through a real thinking process. We felt that that involved more than just a selection on the basis of what simply could not be left out. It meant selection within those movements, an emphasis. It involved the question of method as well as the question of content. So a sub-committee on method was formed.

The Syllabus was to contain the main body-outline of content, a set of method suggestions and discussions connected with each unit. But this was not enough. There should be connected with each unit references for reading. Those references should be of at least two kinds: for teachers and for the additional reading of students.

The Chairman of the Committee was given full time for this work during most of last year. After the Committee had tried to answer the questions as to what should be brought out in high relief, we asked the First Assistants their ideas. (In New York the First Assistant, besides being a salary grade, is also in most cases the title of a chairman of department.) Last year monthly dinners of the Chairman of Departments were held and we discussed the questions of the Syllabus. At an early meeting they were asked to state on paper how they thought the syllabus should be organized. Their organization and emphasis was the same as that in the minds of the Committee.

All that was completed last year was the main body of the syllabus. We did not have time for anything but the merest suggestion for bibliography and methods suggestions.

This year the Sub-Committee on Bibliography has about completed its work. The main Committee is completing the methods suggestions and working over either criticisms of the syllabus or second thoughts of their own. There has not been as much

criticism as was expected, but some criticism came from people of the Catholic faith, who felt that we had not taken into account certain implications, although a Catholic was a member of the Sub-Committee. We went over those very carefully and we found we were able to change words or revise parts which gave offense.

We have rewritten the section on the Agricultural Revolution, and have made minor changes in other sections. At the First Assistants' regular monthly meetings, the First Assistants were asked to give expression to their views. Most were present. Some raised objections which are being considered.

Thus this is truly an experimental syllabus. It was put into effect last term in all schools that wished to try out the first term's work. Some schools are now trying it for the second term's work. Most are trying the first part of the syllabus. It is experimental in the sense that it is still being worked over and it is not a completed product. It does represent an attempt to select only those features of modern life which are of such vital importance that we feel they must be made a real intellectual possession.

The Committee has recommended that only those parts of each unit, which are essential to understanding the movement, should be considered or the teacher be held responsible for. For example, in the section on imperialism, if you understand the nature of the new imperialism, if you understand the problems arising from imperialism, the forces which are working now, you might study these forces anywhere from any set of facts. The comprehension might come about in half a dozen different ways. An examination would be confined to the fundamental ideas of the movement and would be illustrated by any facts.

There has been a real attempt to get at the vital factors in modern life through careful selection of material, and through a teaching process which makes it a true possession. This attempt has been made through an unusually wide cooperation.

A. S. Beatman

NOTE

Mr. Raymond L. Buell, Research Director of the Foreign Policy, Association, delivered a very interesting address, entitled "The London Naval Conference and Its Significance". Unfortunately Mr. Buell was unable to comply with our request to submit his paper for printing in this issue of The Proceedings, as he was leaving the country a short while after the Meeting. If, however, anyone will refer to the *Forum* of June, 1930, it will be possible to learn from Mr. Buell's article printed in that magazine, substantially his point of view.

CONDORCET, THE CAREER OF A PHILOSOPHE DURING THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

In modern revolutionary history a conspicuous part has often been taken by the radical intellectuals. It was they who dreamed of new eras and strove to bring them about. But their role always ended before the Promised Land was reached. At the critical time, the radical intellectuals, more concerned with abstract ideas than with practical necessities, stood in the way of the movements that they themselves had launched. And, in consequence, they were ruthlessly thrust aside by more practical men who knew how to turn dreams into realities. Such has been the pathetic fate of the radical intellectuals. One need but to recall the career of Lamartine in the Revolution of 1848, of Mazzini in the Italian movement for unification, and of Miliukov in the Russian Revolution.

The French Revolution had its ideological precursors, the philosophes of the eighteenth century. It was they who launched the attack on the Old Regime and fervently aimed to established a society based on reason and liberty. For long it was hotly debated in France whether the philosophes were instrumental in bringing about the French Revolution, Aulard, Roustan, Champion, Sainte-Beuve, Taine, and Faguet, all took sides in this debate which was often as acrimonious as it was futile. Curiously enough none of them endeavored to test his views by the career of Condorcet, the only philosophe who lived during the French Revolution, and who was actively identified with nearly all its phases.[1] From Condorcet's views and actions during the Revolution we can have some notion of what might have been the attitude of Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot, Turgot and the other philosophes when they saw all that they had condemned fall into a heap of ruins, and beheld a new system of society and government arise inspired, according to its authors, by their principles.

[1]Raynal and Morellet also lived during the Revolution, but they took no active part in it.

Everyone who reads about the French Revolution comes across the name, Condorcet. And that is about all. Aulard and Jaurès devote more space to him than do the other historians of the French Revolution, chiefly because of their sympathy with his views. In truth he was not a great Revolutionary figure despite the heroic attempt of his biographer, Alengry,[1] to prove that Condorcet was the mentor of the French Revolution. He was not even a figure of secondary importance, such as Sieyès, Desmoulins, and Lafayette. Nevertheless, Condorcet's role was an interesting and significant one, primarily because he was the only representative of the age of reason in the French Revolution.

Marie-Jean Antoine Nicolas Caritat, Marquis de Condorcet was born in 1743, at Ribemont in Picardy. As he came of a noble family his early life was spent in an atmosphere typical of the Ancient Regime. His father was an army officer, and his uncle, a bishop. His early education was entrusted to the Jesuits by his extremely devout mother.

Condorcet first attracted attention because of his brilliant contributions to mathematics. So highly was he regarded as a mathematician that, in 1769, at the age of twenty-six, he was admitted to the Academy of Science. Like all men who were intellectually alive in the France of that day, he became interested in the problems of government and society. He was a frequenter of the salon of Mme. Helvétius where he met the high lights of the Encyclopaedist movement. Two influences drew him away from mathematics to the social sciences, Turgot and Voltaire. He became an intimate friend and devoted disciple of the former to whose influence was due his interest in economics. Condorcet wrote a number of economic essays wherein he expounds the doctrine of the Physiocrats. A visit to Voltaire resulted in an intimate friendship which was maintained by correspondence over a number of years. Like Voltaire, Condorcet came to regard Christianity as the worst of all possible religions, and the Catholic

[1]F. Alengry, *Guide de la Révolution Française* (1904). Other biographies of Condorcet are: J. F. E. Robinet, *Condorcet* (1893) and L. Cahen, *Condorcet et la Révolution française* (1904) Brief sketches of Condorcet's career are to be found in A. Aulard, *Les Orateurs de la Législative et de la Convention* Vol. I (1885), J. Morley, *Critical Miscellanies.* Vol. II (1888-92), F. Picavet, *Les Idealogues* (1891), J. Fabre, *Les Pères de la Revolution* (1910), and H. S e, *L'evolution de la pensée politique en France au* XVIII *e siècle* (1925).

Church as the worst of all churches. It is, however, difficult to judge from his anti-religious writings whether Condorcet was a deist or an atheist.

In the intellectual movement in France prior to the French Revolution, Condorcet was a notable and even a distinguished figure. Like many of his contemporaries, his intellectual interests were exceedingly versatile, all the way from mathematics to sociology. He wrote numerous essays on politics, economics, education, law, religion, morals, slavery, feminism, in all of which his views were typical of the French philosophe who repudiated existing traditions and institutions as being founded on "prejudice" and ignorance and who advocated a new order of things founded on science and reason. His advanced ideas, however, did not bar Condorcet from being admitted to the French Academy, in 1782, at the early age of thirty-nine. This recognition was perhaps due as much to his membership in the privileged class as to his intellectual attainments.

In his views on political reform Condorcet is of especial interest to Americans. Because of Montesquieu's "Spirit of Laws" and Voltaire's "Letters on the English", England was almost universally regarded in France as the land of freedom, and the English parliamentary system as the best means of attaining political liberty. Condorcet refused to accept these views. On the contrary, he severely criticized the English political system, especially the principle of the separation of powers so much praised by Montesquieu. This principle is not the safeguard of liberty, he declared, but, on the contrary, it safeguards the authority of the rich and the privileged. Parliament, he said, did not represent the nation which was really governed by an aristocratic clique.[1] America, declared Condorcet, was the true land of freedom, and the American constitutional system was the best means of attaining political liberty.[2] The American Declaration of Inde-

[1]Idées sur le despotisme, *Oeuvres* (ed. 1847-49) Vol. IX p. 149; see also Lettres d'un bourgeois de New-Haven, *Lettre quatrième*, IX pp. 74-93, H. Sée, *L'evolution de la pensée politique en France au XVIII e siècle*, pp. 285-87.

[2]In his *De l'influence de la Révolution d'Amerique sur l'Europe* (VIII pp. 1-112) Condorcet maintains the view that the independence of the United States resulted in establishing an asylum for the oppressed peoples of Europe, and that the existence of a free republic in America was therefore a check upon European despotism.

pendence and the Bills of Rights of the states had a resounding influence in France, much more so than the state and federal constitutions. A declaration of rights, issued by a national assembly, acquired, in France, an almost magic quality to ward off despotism and to preserve liberty. A declaration of rights, declared Condorcet, "fully complete well-thought out, and very precise is the most useful work that can be offered to mankind."[1] He greatly admired the state constitutions, especially the constitution of Pennsylvania on which he "just doted" (*raffolait*). Pennsylvania, because of Franklin, was regarded in France as the very mirror of political liberty, a strange commentary on the present situation in that notable state. But history only too often reveals the present as a satire on the past. Condorcet also admired the American Constitution which he translated, adding commentaries on each article.[2]

Before the French Revolution, Condorcet was widely known in France as an academician with pronounced liberal views on the subjects of the day. He had served under Turgot when that philosopher-statesman was Controller-General during 1774–1776. He had been active in agitations for reforms of all kinds: abolition of Negro slavery;[3] removal of the disabilities of Protestants;[4] reform of the criminal code;[5] woman's rights;[6] and representative institutions for the nation and the provinces.[7]

The agitation in favor of calling the Estates-General encountered the opposition of Condorcet. He declared that it was a feudal body, controlled by the privileged classes, whose very existence was a violation of natural rights. What he demanded was a popularly elected national assembly with power to issue a declaration of rights and to formulate a constitution.[8] When the Estates-

---

[1]*Déclaration des Droits IX* p. 179; Condorcet wrote a model Declaration of Rights with commentaries, see IX pp. 175-211.

[2]VIII pp. 67-92.

[3]*Réflexions sur l'esclavage des Nègres,* VII pp. 61-140.

[4]*Recueil de pieces sur l'état des Protestants en France,* V pp. 391-573.

[5]*Réflexions sur la jurisprudence criminelle,* VII, pp. 1-24.

[6]*Lettres d'un bourgeois de New-Haven,* IX pp. 1-123.

[7]*Essai sur la constitution et les fonctions des Assemblées rovinciales,* VIII pp. 115-659.

[8]*Lettres d'un citoyen des Etats-Unis,* IX pp. 120-121; *Sentiments d'un Républicain,* IX p. 133.

General gave way to the Constituent Assembly Condorcet followed its activities with the greatest interest, though he was not a member of that body. He was active in creating public opinion in favor of reforms as a pamphleteer and journalist. In fact he was so active that he gave the impression—perhaps even to himself—that he was a member of the Constituent. Condorcet found a fellow spirit in Abbé Sieyès with whom he became very intimate. Together they founded a new club, called the Society of 1789 (*Société de 1789*), which attracted the liberal minded among the nobility. The object of the Society was to provide a forum for discussing the problems of the day from all points of view in order to aid in the pacific transformation of France from despotism to freedom. The Society had an organ, *Journal de la Société de 1789*, which was edited by Condorcet and to which he was a frequent contributor. Like Lafayette he was highly regarded as a noble who had left his class to take up the cause of the people. At that time Condorcet, was a liberal monarchist. "France will remain a monarchy", he wrote, "because this form of government is perhaps the only one that is in harmony with its wealth, its population, its extent, and with the political system in Europe".[1]

The political views of Condorcet during the period of the Constitutent give a clear idea of his attitude of mind, which was essentially that which has come to be associated with the term "liberalism". And he preserved this attitude of mind consistently to the end of his life. The fundamental principle of liberalism is progress which, according to Condorcet, is a natural law to which the social order must conform as unquestioningly as does the physical order to the law of gravitation. A liberal believes in a body of doctrines, called "principles", which are absolute though not rigid. These principles are formulated in declarations of rights and elaborated into a scheme of government by means of constitutions. In practice a liberal must be careful to apply his principles with due regard to existing interests, lest the social order be disrupted. Only when there is a conflict of principle must the liberal be uncompromising; otherwise he should give and take as the exigencies of the situation demand. The way of liberalism is the way of progress by pacific means. "Above all it was my idea", wrote Condorcet, "to establish a system through which the people

[1] *Réflexions sur les pouvoirs*, IX p. 266.

could express its desires on the need of any reform whatsoever, so that never would insurrection be necessary. This idea seemed to me to be as useful as it was novel to the great majority of people."[1]

In no question was Condorcet's liberalism more clear than in his attitude toward the laws of the Constituent against the Church. As a devout disciple of Voltaire he outdid even his master in his hatred of Catholicism. But he distinguished between religion as a private opinion which should be fully and freely allowed; and the Church as a political power which should not be tolerated under any circumstances. He opposed the Civil Constitution of the Clergy because it recognized the clergy as state officials; what he favored was separation of Church and State, though he does not clearly enunciate this doctrine. But he criticized the spoilation of the Church and demanded that compensation should be given for its confiscated property. Especially should the monks and nuns, left helpless by the suppression of their Orders, receive pensions sufficient for their needs according to the rules of their Order. "When a corporation is destroyed," declared Condorcet, "one sees in those who composed it only individuals with their virtues and vices, having the same rights as other men, and who therefore should be treated according to the same principles of justice and humanity."[2]

Condorcet's change from a constitutional monarchist to a democratic republican, although rapid, was not sudden. In 1790, he wrote a pamphlet, *On the Admission of Women to the Right of Suffrage*,[3] which created a sensation. It advocated votes for women. From the days of Mary Wollstonecraft to Emmeline Pankhurst all the arguments advanced by suffragists and all the refutations of the anti-suffragists can be found in this pamphlet and in a book that Condorcet had written in 1787, *Letters of a citizen of New Haven*.[4] "The rights of men", declares Condorcet, "result solely from the fact that men are impressionable beings,

---

[1] *Fragment de justification*, I pp. 575-76.

[2] *Réflexions sur l'usufruit des Bénéficiers* X pp. 19-20; See also *Sur le Décret du 13 Avril 1790*, X pp. 93-103; *sur la constitution civile du clérgé*, *Sur la nécessité d' ôter au clergé l'état civil des citoyens*, *Sur le Décret du 26 Aout, 1792*, XII pp. 1-27.

[3] *Sur l'admission des femmes au droit de Cité*, X pp. 119-30.

[4] *Lettres d'un bourgeois de New-Haven*, IX pp. 1-123.

susceptible to moral ideas, and of reasoning from these ideas. As women have the same qualities as men they necessarily have the same rights. Either no one truly has any rights or all have the same ones. And he who is against the rights of another because of religion, color, or sex abjures his own''.[1] He expressed his astonishment that an Assembly, zealously engaged in establishing human equality, should tranquilly deprive half the human race of political rights.

Condorcet received much greater support when he came out in favor of universal manhood suffrage. He criticized the constitution of 1791 for establishing a property qualification for voting and an especially high property qualification (*marc d'argent*) for election to the legislature.[2] His democratic tendencies were greatly strengthened by the founding of the Republic of the United States. Republicanism, in the eighteenth century, was identified with the ancient city states or with the Swiss cantons. The dictum of Montesquieu that a republican form of government was suited only to small states was universally accepted. But the appearance of a great republic on the other side of the Atlantic caused many to consider the possibility of a large state having a republican form of government. Since 1787 Condorcet had formed an intimate friendship with Thomas Paine who greatly influenced his views regarding republicanism. However, it was the flight of Louis XVI that was the immediate occasion for the conversion of Condorcet to a republican form of government. Shortly after the Flight to Varennes he delivered an address in which he boldly proclaimed himself in favor of a republic.[3] He declared that constitutional monarchy, regarded as a barrier to tyranny, was no longer necessary. New barriers had been erected by the constitution, especially freedom of speech. ''All who have read attentively the history of the usurpation of Cromwell, he declared, ''know full well that a single newspaper would have been sufficient to have prevented it.'' And if the English had read other books besides the Bible, Cromwell would not have been dangerous. Cromwell, it

---

[1]*Sur l'admission*, X p. 122.

[2]*Addresse à l'Assemblée Nationale* X, pp. 79-91. Before the French Revolution Condorcet had favored a propertied suffrage, see *Essai sur la constitution et les fonctions des Assemblées Provinciales*, VIII pp. 127-42.

[3]*De la République*, XII pp. 227-37.

should be noted, is only a recent acquisition to the hall of famous libertarians. During the eighteenth century he was regarded by the philosophes as a usurping tyrant and superstitious fanatic. Barriers can be erected against a usurping legislature, argues Condorcet, by frequent elections, by elected executives, and by periodic constitutional conventions. "We no longer live in the days when, to assure the power of the laws, we had to depend on the impious superstitution which made of the king a kind of divinity." Condorcet ridiculed a constitutional monarch as a kind of mechanism, in which a robot king functions as well as a live one.[1] "It was an event", writes the great historian of the French Revolution, Aulard, "to hear the greatest thinker of that day, the disciple and heir of the Encyclopedists, preach the republic which all the philosophes, his masters, had declared impossible or dangerous to establish in France."[2] Condorcet's pronouncement had considerable influence in the formation of a republican party which felt itself "legitimatized by the stirring intervention of the heir of the philosophes".[3] But he was bitterly denounced by his aristocratic friends, who now beheld a traitor in the man that they had revered as guide and philosopher.

Condorcet was elected a member of the Legislative Assembly. He was not chosen as a republican, as might be supposed, but as a distinguished academician whose democratic views and noble lineage had made him very popular with the liberal bourgeois. The majority of the Assembly was monarchist. In opposition, on the left, was a group, later known as the Girondins, led by Brissot. Like Lamartine in 1848 Condorcet sat neither to the right nor to the left, but, as Lamartine put it, "on the ceiling". He boasted of belonging to no faction but to that small group of men who were "just, enlightened, incorruptible, ardent defenders of the rights of the people."[4] Generally he acted with the Brissotins, who, like himself, were platonic republicans. For all practical purposes they accepted the monarchical constitution of 1791.

If Condorcet can at all be said to have played a prominent role in the French Revolution it was during the short life of the

---

[1]*Lettre d'un jeune mécanicien*, XII pp. 239-41.

[2]A. Aulard, *Histoire politique de la Révolution française*, (1901) pp. 138-39.

[3]Aulard, *op. cit.* p. 140.

[4]Quoted in L. Cahen, *Condorcet et la Revolution française*, p. 437.

Legislative Assembly, (October 1, 1791—September 20, 1792). He was first elected one of its secretaries, then vice-president, and finally, president. Students of the French Revolution well know the ineptness of the Legislative Assembly when it came to action. But it is famous for proclamations, orations, reports, and addresses. In such a body Condorcet was in his element. It was he who wrote most of the addresses and proclamations. As an orator, however, Condorcet was a complete failure. His manner of speaking was "cold and awkward, his gestures, restrained and weary; and his lack of spontaneity and variety" made him the very antithesis of a French Revolutionary orator.[1] His speeches were rhetorical, even declamatory, yet cold and academic, burdened with a kind of abstract eloquence addressed to posterity not to an audience.[2] Nevertheless his speeches, which were often read, were heard with the greatest attention by the Assembly because the rather cold and diffident orator was a liberty intoxicated man, zealous for every reform that would make humanity more enlightened, more free, more happy. "A volcano covered with snow" D'Alembert had once characterized Condorcet. "On these hesitating and cold lips", writes Aulard, "hung the Assembly, France and even Europe eager to know how the friend of Voltaire, D'Alembert, and Turgot judged the Revolution".[3]

The most famous report issued by the Assembly was that of the committee on public education. It was written by Condorcet, its chairman, and is undoubtedly Condorcet's chief Revolutionary contribution.[4] Popular education was a fairly familiar idea in eighteenth-century France.[5] Talleyrand had presented a plan of national education to the members of the Constituent As-

[1]Cahen, *op. cit.* p. 174.

[2]Eloquence that seduces an Assembly, declared Condorcet, unconsciously apologetic for his oratorical deficiencies, has in it the germ of corruption because a representative body has more need of enlightenment than of moving eloquence, see *Sur l'Instruction publique*, VII p. 474.

[3]Aulard, *Les orateurs de la Législative et de la Convention*, I p. 281.

[4]*Sur l'Instruction publique*, VII pp. 167-573; see J. Jaurès, *Histoire socialiste de la Revolution française*, (ed. 1922-24) III pp. 431-52.

[4]The Physiocrats advocated universal education in order to instruct the people in the principles of the Natural Order, see N. Baudeau, *Introduction à la philosophie economique* in E. Daire (ed.), *Physiocrates* (1846). Diderot, too, was a strong advocate of universal education, see his essay, *Des écoles publiques* in M. Tourneux, *Diderot et Catherine II* (1900).

sembly.[1] But it was Condorcet who clearly realized the importance of popular education as an instrument of national power and as a means of safeguarding progress and of advancing social equality. His report is a landmark in the history of education; many of its provisions are quite startling in their moderness. It demanded the establishment of a national system of primary, secondary, and higher education, which was to be free, secular, and equal as between men and women. Co-education in the elementary schools, according to Condorcet, would lead to comradeship between the sexes, and therefore to high standards of sex morality. The government was to provide for the system of education but was not to direct it. A national body of learned men were to regulate the curriculum and to appoint the teachers. All types of schools were to be established, cultural, trade, and professional. Brilliant students were to be given national scholarships, *elévès de la patrie*, and boarded at public expense at special schools. Teaching was to be in the spirit of free examination not of authority, especially the teaching of politics and government. To teach the constitution of a country "as a dogma that is universally true"writes Condorcet, "or to arouse blind enthusiasm in its favor is to make the citizens incapable of judging it.....a political religion would arise that would fetter the mind, thereby violating liberty in its most sacred aspect under the pretext of teaching to cherish it. The aim of education is not to arouse admiration for established laws but to render men capable of appreciating and of correcting them".[2] In order that the educational system should always keep step with progress, Condorcet provided for periodic examinations of teachers, textbooks, and methods of teaching. The report contains a comprehensive curriculum for each type of school, the outstanding characteristics of which are the stressing of science, modern languages, the history of civilization, and the limitation of the classics the teaching of which is severely condemned. There is a provision for what would be called today adult education; popular lectures were to be given on progress in the various fields of knowledge. The report was tabled by the Assembly, due to the exigencies of the war against Austria.

[1]Jaurès, *op. cit.* III pp. 413-31.
[2]*Sur l'Instruction publique*, VII p. 212.

If the report on education shows Condorcet at his best as an educator his conduct during the crises of 1792 shows him at his worst as a Revolutionary statesman. Austria and Prussia were dispatching their forces. The émigrés were hovering on the frontier secretly aided by the traitorous King. What was to be done about the émigrés? Condorcet proposed a plan to distinguish those of the émigrés who renounced the laws of their country from those who conspired against them.[1] Those who refused to take the oath of allegiance to the constitution, but who did not serve in foreign armies, were to be treated as foreigners with all the rights of foreigners. Those who refused and served in foreign armies were to be punished as traitors. Condorcet's plan showed no practical sense of the situation, and it was, therefore, disregarded by the Assembly.

What was to be done with the King? Condorcet's answer to this question illustrates again his inability to see a crisis, demanding extraordinary action. As a consequence of the defeat of the French troops and of the Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick, popular feeling against the traitorous court became so menacing that the Assembly appointed a committee to consider the suspension of Louis XVI. Condorcet was made a member of this committee, and wrote its report. It was largely a technical discussion of constitutional limitations concerning abdication and suspension; to suspend Louis would be unconstitutional, it argued, therefore, the report advised against any action in the matter.[2] Condorcet then proposed a vague scheme of educating the people on the exercise of their sovereign rights.[3] This report was read on the eve of August 10. "He heard the rumbling of the popular storm," writes Alengry, "and he sought a shelter in the constitution."[4] The report was tabled. On the following day, August 10, *le peuple* appeared with Danton and his mob. The uprising of the Parisian populace caused the Assembly to decree the suspension of Louis XVI. A provisional executive council was appointed, all the members of which were Bissotins except Danton. Curiously

---

[1] *Opinion sur les émigrants*, X pp. 223-42.

[2] *Rapport*, X pp. 521-30.

[3] *Instruction sur l'exercise du droit de souveraineté*, X pp. 531-40; see *Moniteur*, VII p. 938.

[4] Alengry, *op. cit.* p. 157.

enough Danton's inclusion was due to Condorcet. Of the three most prominent leaders of the Paris populace, Marat, Robespierre, and Danton, he preferred the last, though he hated the violent methods of all of them. Robespierre he considered a fanatic, and Marat, a lunatic. Danton's expansive temperament might, however, cause him to be more malleable. "It was necessary," said Condorcet, "to have a man in the council who had the confidence of these very people whose agitation had just overturned the monarchy.....who, by his leadership, could restrain the very contemptible tools of a revolution that was useful, glorious, and necessary."[1] The burly figure of Danton was to stand between the mob and the representatives of the nation.

Condorcet's career in the Legislative Assembly, begun so auspiciously, ended in utter futility. His policies had been repudiated, and his reports, tabled. Perhaps he had dreamed of being the Turgot of the Revolution who would achieve success where his master had failed because he would have the support of a powerful, enlightened people, not that, as in the case of Turgot, of a weak and dull monarch. But Condorcet proved to be the most inept member of the inept Legislative Assembly. Evidently revolution was not the atmosphere suited to a philosophe turned statesman.

The Republic, proclaimed by the Convention in September 21, 1792, was the direct and immediate outcome of the popular insurrection of August 10. Condorcet, the pioneer republican, stood aghast. He had imagined that so ideal a government would be established by statesmen and philosophers after calmly deliberating, long and earnestly, on the problems of government and society. But the First French Republic was created over night amidst wild disorder, mob violence, and fearful massacres. It was a red spectre instead of a glorious vision. Those who created the Republic regarded republicanism less as a theory of political science than as a weapon with which to smite kings, aristocrats, and priests. And, to this day in France, republicanism has been so regarded by its adherents.

When *le peuple* became a reality instead of an abstraction Condorcet experienced a sense of painful confusion. He "mourned

[1] *Fragment du justification*, I p. 602.

deeply over the violations of the majesty of the laws, over the outrages against the rights of nature.''[1] He denounced the agitators who ''give the name people to those corrupt or mistaken men that they assemble in mobs''.[2] But his faith in progress was too great to cause him to become a reactionary. On the contrary, he held on to his abstraction all the more firmly. He accepted the Republic wholeheartedly, and sought to guide it in peaceful paths.[3]

As a member of the Convention, Condorcet was affiliated neither with the Girondins, nor with the Jacobins. He represented, as he said, the ''public''. He criticized the Girondins because of their federalism, and the Jacobins because they were more violent than enlightened. Generally, he acted with the Girondins. In the Legislative Assembly Condorcet's part had been futile; but in the Convention it was pathetic. The tumultuous atmosphere of that body with menacing mobs outside—and sometimes inside—was not the deliberative assembly, dreamed of by Condorcet, to draw up a constitution for France. It was the scene of terrific clashes of fundamental social interests and of ruthless ambitions of the most vivid personalities. He soon found himself ''in the melee of ambitions and interests in which his naturally fine social instincts and great delicacy were useless and which prevented him from unravelling the threads of so many intrigues.''[4]

In the fierce party strife between Girondins and Jacobins Condorcet found that there was no ''public'', and he was, therefore, in a position of dangerous isolation, like all true liberals in a crisis. In normal times all factions turn to the liberal; in times of crisis all turn against him. By the Rolands he was despised as a weak reed at best, as a tool of the Jacobins, at worst. ''His intelligence in relation to his personality,'' declared Mme. Roland, ''is like a fine liqueur soaked in cotton. . . . .He is as feeble of heart as of health''.[5] By the Jacobins he was regarded either

---

[1]*Le véritable et le faux ami du peuple*, I p. 530.

[2]*Sur la nouvelle constitution*, XII p. 663, see also *Fragment de justification*, I pp. 603-04.

[3]In a pamphlet, *Réflexions sur la Revolution de 1688, et sur celle du 10 Aout 1792*, (XII, pp. 194-213) Condorcet becomes an apologist for the insurrection of August 10 on the ground that the French people could not see their liberties menaced *sans inquiétude*.

[4]Robinet, *Condorcet*, p. 124.

[5]Alengry, *op. cit.* p. 229.

with suspicion because of his noble origin or with contempt because of his being an academician. Condorcet rarely addressed the Convention, and whenever he did so he was listened to with contemptuous silence. His only supporter in that body was his old friend Thomas Paine.

Condorcet first earned the active hostility of the Jacobins because of his attitude toward the trial of Louis XVI. In his opinion the Convention was not legally competent to try the King because it could not be legislature, accuser, and judge at the same time. He was so naive that he actually feared that the Convention was prejudiced against Louis and would find him guilty.[1] To Condorcet, Louis was now an ordinary citizen, and therefore endowed with natural rights which were valid in times of crises no less than in normal times. And fundamental principles could not be hurried by transient circumstances. A crisis to Condorcet was like any other event *sub specie aeternitatis;* for natural rights were universal absolute truths derived from the very nature of man and society, therefore valid at all times and in all places. He proposed that Louis be tried by a national jury chosen by the electoral bodies in the departments. In sharp contrast to the views of Condorcet were those of Robespierre. "Louis", said the latter to the Convention, "is not an accused. You are not judges. You cannot be other than statesmen and representatives of the nation." To consider Louis an ordinary citizen entitled to a regular court trial was to confuse the situation of a people in a state of revolution with one having a stable government.[2]

Needless to say, the Convention rejected Condorcet's plea and tried Louis. When the vote was taken Condorcet voted that the King was guilty; but he, together with Paine, refused to vote for the death penalty. "Execute the king but not the man," they declared. The execution of Charles I during the English Revolution, they reasoned, did not result in the abolition of monarchy; on the contrary, it resulted in its restoration. Paine voted for the imprisonment of Louis while the war with Austria and Prussia was in progress; and for his perpetual banishment after the war.

[1]See *Opinion sur le jugement de Louis* XVI, XII, pp. 267-303.

[2]H. M. Stephens, *The Principal speeches of the Statesmen and Orators of the French Revolution* (1892), II p. 358.

Condorcet voted for "the severest punishment in the penal code short of death" on the ground that he was opposed, on principle, to capital punishment.[1] When the Convention voted the death penalty, Condorcet demanded a respite for the condemned monarch on the ground that the execution of Louis would rouse popular sentiment in Europe against France. "Foreign rulers", he wrote, "will be compelled to inspire their subjects with hatred for France and thereby get national support for the war that they have declared". To conciliate the nations of Europe, Condorcet advised the Convention to pass social reform laws, such as the abolition of capital punishment, the establishment of foundlings asylums, public charities, the suppression of lotteries, and the abolition of imprisonment for debt.[2] But Condorcet's plea to conciliate foreign nations by social reform did not persuade the Convention to grant a respite to Louis XVI.

The chief work of Condorcet in the Convention was a project for a constitution of the French Republic. In 1792 that body appointed a commission to draft a constitution. It consisted of Sieyés, Pétion, Paine, Vergniaud, Brissot, Gensonné, Barére, Condorcet, and Danton. The majority was Girondin; Danton was the only Jacobin on the commission. Condorcet, as a well-known writer on political science, was made chairman. This was the greatest opportunity of his life. "For thirty years I have hardly passed a day without meditating on the political sciences," he had once declared. He felt that he was a modern Legislator who would bestow a free constitution to his fellow citizens. The ancient myth of the Legislator, giving laws to peoples, was commonly believed by the skeptics of the eighteenth century. The Girondin constitution of 1793, known as *La Girondine*, was the work chiefly of Condorcet assisted by Paine. Danton never attended the sessions of the committee. Accustomed to the easy triumphs of eloquent oratory he was temperamentally averse to the hard and concentrated work of committees. The other members participated but little, perhaps because Condorcet's zeal had the effect of increasing their confidence and de-

[1] *Opinion de Condorcet*, XII pp. 304-11.

[2] *Exposition des principes et des motifs du Plan de Constitution*, XII, pp. 335-415; *Projet de Déclaration des Droits*, pp. 416-22; and *Projet de constitution française*, pp. 423-501.

creasing their activity. The Girondin constitution of 1793 was almost entirely the outcome of the meditations of Condorcet.

Condorcet's attitude toward constitution making was typical of the eighteenth century idealogue. France was now a political *tabula rasa* on which he was free to write a model constitution for all peoples, based upon the fundamental principles of popular sovereignty, liberty, and equality. In drawing up his document, Condorcet violated Napoleon's dictum that a constitution should be short and abscure. It was very long, and fills eighty-five pages of his collected works.[1] An integral part of it was a Declaration of Rights which follows the famous Declaration of Rights of Man and Citizen. However, it added several significant clauses, as for example, "Education is the need of all, and society owes it equally to all its members"; and "A people always has the right to revise, to reform, and to change its constitution. One generation has not the right to subject future generations to its laws. All heredity in office is absurd and tyrannical".[2]

The constitution is exceedingly detailed and specific in the desire to make definite and positive the application of abstract ideas to political methods. It provided for a republic "one and indivisible". Legislative power was vested in a parliament of one house, elected annually by universal male suffrage. Curiously enough this pioneer of woman suffrage did not give the vote to woman. The only possible explanation is that, just as he was dismayed when *le peuple* appeared in the mobs of Paris, he was disgusted when *la femme* appeared in the *Faubourriennes*, the market women mobilized by Marat to disturb the sittings of the Convention. Condorcet's constitution emphasized especially the liberty of the individual as against arbitrary action of the government. There were long and detailed provisions guaranteeing the rights of citizens and limiting the actions of the government. Executive power was to be exercised by a popularly elected committee. To insure a popular censorship of the acts of parliament the constitution provided for the initiative and the referendum. Under certain conditions a petition to repeal an existing law or to enact a new one had to be submitted to a referendum. Constitutional changes could

---

[1]XII pp. 421,422.
[2]See debate in the *Moniteur*, VIII p. 249.

be initiated at any time; and special conventions, elected every twenty years, were to revise the entire document. Condorcet's project itself was to be submitted to a referendum. Capital punishment was to be abolished for private crimes. There was to be no annexation of territory unless so voted by a plebiscite.[1]

When the project was first submitted (February 15-16, 1793) to the Convention it received little attention from that body. The critical situation in '93, the uprising in La Vendée, and the concentration of foreign armies on the frontiers distracted attention from the project. Moreover, its Girondin origin roused the hostility of the Jacobins. It was attacked by Robespierre and Saint-Just as an aristocratic document that was too favorable to property rights, and as complicated and unworkable.[2]

As the Convention became the scene of hostility between Girondin and Jacobin, Condorcet became concerned with the fate of his constitution. Was it to be put aside like his report on education in the Legislative Assembly? He issued a pamphlet in which he declared that the adoption of a constitution was necessary in order to establish stable institutions without which there could be neither liberty, equality, nor property; the country would oscillate between tyranny and anarchy.[3] But no attention was paid to his plea for action on his project.

After the expulsion of the Girondins from the Convention Condorcet's constitution was doomed. It was rudely thrown aside by those hard-boiled idealists, the Jacobins, who were more concerned with leaving a government than a constitution. A committee was appointed by the Committee of Public Safety to draft a new constitution. Its chairman was Herault-Sèchelles who drew up a plan in less than a week. On June 10 it was presented to the Convention, and was adopted on the same day with hardly any debate. The plan was then submitted to a referendum, and it was accepted by the people of France. The Constitution of 1793 provides for a unicameral legislature elected by universal manhood

---

[1]For a critical study of *La Girondine*, see A Stern, Condorcet und der Girondistische Verfassungsentwurf von 1793 in *Historische Zeitschrift*, Vol. 141.
[2]Robespierre delivered a remarkable address on the rights of property, see *Moniteur*, VIII p. 509.
[3]*Sur la necessité d'établir en France une constitution nouvelle*, XII pp. 529-42; see also Condorcet's address to the Convention, XII pp. 581-97.

suffrage; and for a ministry appointed by and responsible to the legislature. It also contains provisions for a referendum.[1]

Condorcet's amour propre was deeply hurt by the rejection of his constitution. The greatest effort of his public life had been frustrated by men whom he despised as demagogues and ignoramuses. They had contemptuously thrown aside his project, the product of years of study of political science, and had put through a hastily concocted document which, he declared, was a caricature of his constitution. Again, Condorcet failed to sense the critical situation of France in 1793. In the tumultuous Paris of 1793 he imagined that he was in quiet Philadelphia in 1787. America needed a constitution to achieve a more perfect union and to have a national Bill of Rights. France, in 1793, had achieved a more perfect union and had acquired a Declaration of Rights. She needed a constitution to give a popular sanction to a dictatorship in order to tide over a crisis. That was the function of the constitution of 1793; once the crisis was over it was not even applied. There has never been in France that constitution worship so prevalent in America. France has had too many constitutions to believe in the plenary inspiration of a scheme of government.

Condorcet was so ill-advised as to issue a pamphlet in which he denounced the ousting of the Girondins from the Convention, and attacked the Jacobin constitution.[2] He compared his constitution with the one submitted to the people, to the disadvantage of the latter which, he said, was brief because it surmounted difficulties by avoiding them. By this action Condorcet foolishly identified himself with the Girondins, which greatly irritated the Jacobins who did not hate him as they did the Girondins. Although the author of the Girondin constitution, Condorcet had not been ousted from the Convention. Knowing his honesty and political incapacity the Jacobins would have suffered him to live, had it not been for his act of folly in challenging their constitution.

---

[1]The text of the constitution of 1793 can be found in F. M. Anderson, (ed.), *The Constitutions and other Select Documents Illustrative of the History of France*, (1908), pp. 171-84; see discussion in Aulard, *Histoire politique*, pp. 280-313, and A. Mathiez, "La Constitution de 1793" in *Revue de Paris*, (July-Aug. 1928.)

[2]*Sur la nouvelle constitution*, XII pp. 651-75.

On July 10, 1793 Chabot, a member of the Convention, bitterly denounced Condorcet's pamphlet as seditious, and demanded the arrest of its author. "This man", said Chabot, "who because he sits among the learned in the Academy imagines that he has the right to give laws to the French Republic."[1] The Convention passed the motion of Chabot to add Condorcet's name to the list of the proscribed.

To escape the guillotine the philosophe found a hiding place in a pension kept by a Madame Vernet, who shielded him from the Terrorists, despite grave danger to herself. For about nine months Condorcet lived in this retreat, engaged in writing his famous *Sketch of the Intellectual Progress of Mankind.*[2] This pioneer work in intellectual history traces the evolution of mankind through nine Epochs, each characterized by a dominant idea. The leading motive of the book is the idea of progress, or the unlimited perfectibility of mankind, an idea which Condorcet's book did much to popularize. If any one wishes a modern instance comparable to Socrates calmly discoursing philosophy, while waiting death in his prison cell, he could find it in Condorcet calmly writing on the perfectibility of mankind under the shadow of the guillotine. The true greatness of the philosophe was never more evident than in his attitude toward the Revolution which now threatened to destroy him. He did not turn reactionary because the French Revolution had not gone his way. Although he hated terrorism and violence with all his soul he knew what had raised the specter, "what passion and weakness gave to it substance, and he knew that presently reason would banish it and restore men to a right mind. The scientific spirit implanted in such a character as Condorcet's and made robust by social

[1]XII p. 678; *Moniteur*, VIII p. 822.

[2]*Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique des progrès d'l'esprit humain*, VI. For critical estimates of this work, see J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (1920); R. Flint, *Philosophy of History in France* (1875); J. Delvaille, *Essai sur l'histoire de l' Idée de Progrès*, (1910); E. Kohn-Bramstest, "Condorcet und das Geschichtsbild des späten Aufklärung" in *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, Vol. XX; J. S. Schapiro, *The Esquisse of Condorcet* in "Essays in Intellectual History", Dedicated to James Harvey Robinson by his former Seminar Students (1929).

meditation builds up an impregnable fortitude in the face of incessant rebuffs and discouragements."[1]

Unwilling any longer to expose the loyal Madame Vernet to the vengeance of the Terrorist Condorcet left his retreat in disguise. He wandered in the country outside of Paris, half-starved, with a copy of Horace in his pocket. One day he was arrested as a suspicious character and lodged in prison. The next day, April 8, 1794, his jailer found him dead of poisoning. Condorcet had cheated the guillotine by committing suicide.

Condorcet's career during the French Revolution was typical of the revolutionary intellectual when confronted with the swift and merciless facts of social warfare. For him the French Revolution was a struggle between enlightened opinion and unreasoning prejudice, and the struggle would begin and end with the spoken and written word, now at last unshackled. He never really understood the nature of the irreconcilable conflict of interests that the Revolution had roused, nor the mad passions that it had unleashed. Therefore Condorcet had no following; behind him was neither a party in the legislature nor a mob in the street. Feeling a sense of superiority over the Marats, the Dantons, and the Robespierres because of his intellectual attainments he imagined that he could direct the policies of France by appeals to reason. Condorcet was the last representative of the Age of Reason which had never visualized a Reign of Terror. His death signalized the end of an era when faith in reason had reigned supreme.

J. Salwyn Schapiro

The College of the City of New York

---

[1] J. Morley, *Critical Miscellanies*, II p. 196.

SOME OBJECTIVES OF SOCIAL SCIENCE TEACHING

History and geography and civics have been taught in our schools for a long while, either separately or together. Latterly, special courses have been added to the curriculum on economics and on a miscellany of social information which is sometimes labelled sociology. Conventionally all these subjects are styled "social sciences" or "social studies," and their exponents vie with the exponents of equally conventional "natural sciences" and "humanistic studies" in seeking for them greater prestige and more hours of instruction.

But why teach the social sciences at all? Why confound an already confused curriculum with more and more of them? To these questions many persons have given more or less reasoned answers, and presently I myself shall attempt to do likewise. Unfortunately, however, most teachers and most principals and superintendents and the public at large expend little thought on the fundamental, *why*, or, if they do, their actions betray rather crazy results of their ratiocination. They seem to act primarily because of habit, of vested interests, of external pressure, or of passing fads and fancies. The teacher of history teaches history because he has been trained to teach it and gets paid for teaching it; he tends to teach it as his old professor in college or normal school would have him teach it, modified, of course, as to content and method, by what legislators and local school authorities impose upon him. The teacher of history, like any teacher who would keep his job, is a submissive soul with just a dash of personal ambition. If the state authorities direct that civics shall be taught apart from history in special courses so many hours a week for so many years, the teacher of history conforms and may become a teacher of civics at nine o'clock and of non-civic history at ten o'clock. If the local school authorities, pressed by the chamber of commerce or banking members of the Board of Education, ordain that, in a world so menaced as ours is by the spectre of communism, sound principles of economics and capitalism shall be inculcated in special classes, the teacher of history is likely to

assent, however perfunctorily, and to become at eleven o'clock a teacher of economics. Then, as the state-imposed civics and the locally imposed economics become entrenched and create new vested interests, the superintendents and other bigwig educators hold many a conference as to how they may relieve the distressed and distressing curriculum. They may decide, in their wisdom, or in their despair, to have the non-civic and non-economic history given in smaller doses, say at ten o'clock on alternate days or to have the history instruction of twelve grades telescoped into a one-year survey of all the past of the entire human race, or, perhaps, to scrap the separate courses of special social study in favor of an omnibus course based on the children's reading of the morning newspaper or, preferably, the Literary Digest. In any event, the teacher of history is apt to acquiesce; if he has more than a dash of personal ambition, he will aid and abet. For in any case, his not to reason why, his but to do and — live! We seemingly end here without rhyme as well as without reason.

We are certainly in a fearful mess today in our schools. For a goodly number of years we have tinkered, or, as the more naïve among us express it, we have "experimented" with the teaching of the social sciences, collectively and individually, at every level in public and private education. We have extolled "projects." We have "measured" and been "measured." We have spawned syllabi and curricula. The only thing which many of us have utterly failed to do is to reason about the experimenting and the tinkering, to ask ourselves the why and the wherefor, to seek some large measure of agreement in the public mind as to the fundamental objectives of all the current projects and measurements, syllabi and curricula.

In other words, we have been so intent upon details of method and so anxious to experiment with every novelty that we have followed fads and neglected philosophies. Yet I cannot see how we can judge of the efficacy of anything we do unless we act with some purpose, that is, unless we adhere to some philosophy. We must have some standard of value. We must set some ideal goal.

I am not pleading for any particular "philosophy of history." As an historian, I always shudder when sociologists or theologians or a certain type of literary gentlemen place preconceived interpre-

tations upon disputable occurrences of the past and call them "philosophies of history." I am no advocate of any simple explanation as to why man exists or as to how he has behaved. I am a sceptic about history as a clear record of God's wondrous ways with man. I am even a sceptic about any absolute law of cause and effect in human history, or, at any rate, about our ability to comprehend fully how such a "law" operates in particular cases. "Law" in history disturbs and disconcerts me.

But, while eschewing philosophies of history in general, I make bold to insist that we teachers of the social sciences must accept a particular and partial philosophy, by light of which we construct our courses and curricula and in terms of which we measure our achievements, and that we must strive to convert to this philosophy not only school administrators but the mass of our fellow countrymen.

The philosophy which I suggest contains two propositions: (1) That social science is fundamental for all educated human beings; (2) That human beings are capable of self-improvement. This may sound platitudinous, but it really needs little elucidation. The phrase "social science," particularly the word "science," has recently been acquiring an almost mystical significance. Let me warn you that there is nothing mystical in my use of the word or phrase. I find that many ideas when expressed in English words of Latin derivation tend, like ships, to collect on their hulls a mass of foreign barnacles and that they can be easily scraped clear of their accretions by the simple device of re-expressing them in words of Anglo-Saxon derivation. So, to rid "science" of its mysticism, let us substitute for it the plain word "knowledge" or the equally plain word "understanding." "Social science" thus becomes a phrase signifying knowledge or understanding of human society and of the place of the individual in human society, that is, knowledge or understanding of the human race and of human relationships. And I assert that this is fundamental for all educated human beings.

It is not meant that social science is the only knowledge which should be imparted to school-children. None of us would question, I assume, that knowledge or understanding of the universe of nature and matter, so-called "natural science," should occupy an important place in educational curricula. Many of us think,

moreover, that knowledge of art, of ethics, and of religion is of very great importance to educated human beings. Without violating the traditional "neutrality" of our schools in the matter of specific religions and in that of particular codes of morality, religion and ethics in general—and likewise art and nature—in so far as they have conditioned and complicated human relationships and are still doing so, must be closely articulated with social science. In this sense, then, social science should be the chief concern and the ultimate core of all school-instruction.

Certain tools, of course, are necessary for advancement in social knowledge. There must obviously be instruction in the national language, in reading and writing, and also in figuring and drawing, and instruction, at least in the upper reaches, in foreign languages. But tools are not an end in themselves; they are means to another end. This end is social knowledge—social science—which can and must be served not only by specific instruction in it, not only by closely articulated instruction in art and nature, but also by relevant instruction in all the tools I have mentioned.

You recall that the philosophy, as I stated it, contained two propositions. The first — "That social science is fundamental for all educated human beings,"—is not likely, if properly understood, to arouse among reflective persons any serious dissent. To me, in my weakness, it appears self-evident. The second proposition—"That human beings are capable of self-improvement"—is more questionable; it is, frankly, an hypothesis.

If it is true that men are perpetually doomed by original sin or animal mind to a constant round of the same toil and trouble, then social study may at best provide a slight mental divertissement, though its chief utility will consist in teaching the young to expect the worst.

Or, if it is true that men are petty chemical compounds, without spirit or will, in an endlessly evolving universe, it hardly matters what the compounds are taught in their nascent state. They will simply have to evolve, and the universe about them will simply have to evolve, precisely as the laws of celestial mechanics dictate.

Or, if it is true that men are pre-destined by something outside of themselves—call it Nature or call it God—to behave in a

particular way, to undergo improvement perhaps at one time and deterioration at another time, then social study may be directed toward the discovery of the secrets of God or Nature but it can scarcely be expected to alter the consequences of those secrets.

No man knows positively if any of these hypotheses is true. No man knows absolutely the truth of any alternative hypothesis. Yet I clearly imply just such an hypothesis when I assert that human beings are capable of self-improvement. It is part of my philosophy that men, within relatively narrow and vague limits, can and do exercise some real freedom of will, that they can and do learn from their own experience and from the experience of others, and that they can and do exert an appreciable influence on the course of human events, aye, even though infinitesimally, on the universe of matter.

This is an integral part of the philosophy which I would have you accept not only with the lips but with mind and heart. I would have you moved and stimulated by it. It is, let me repeat, an hypothesis; it is not susceptible of mathematical demonstration. But how few persons get excited about the mere certainty that two and two make four! At any rate, the hypothesis before us is practical and workable. It is the only excuse I know for teaching anything, or for maintaining any school, or for paying any teacher. If we cannot agree on it, we may as well cease to talk about educational reform and either abandon our profession or continue in it as cynics or hypocrites.

If we will agree enthusiastically on the philosophy that human beings are capable of self-improvement and that social science is fundamental for all educated human beings, we shall be in a position to exert increasing influence on the nation, and, if the nation accepts our philosophy, we can move forward with confidence and reason to refashion curricula and courses of study. It will take time, but the first responsibility is with the teachers and administrators of our schools.

I myself am no specialist on curricula or courses of study, and I am utterly lacking in prophetic inspiration. Far be it from me to tell you what particular courses should or will be put into the school-curriculum at any given point. The only things about which I am clear and ready to express a conviction are first, that all future curricula must be based ultimately upon the philosophy

which has already been expounded, and, secondly, that they must take large account of certain corollaries which are derivable from that philosophy and which I shall now endeavor briefly to set forth. These constitute so many special objectives in the teaching of the social sciences.

In the first place, our philosophy requires us to teach the dynamic, rather than the static, character of human relationships. We must take account of the impressive fact that the world of today is vastly different from the ancient or medieval world, that a new material and industrial civilization is emerging with the swift contemporary progress of the mechanical arts, that we live in an age when human relationships are assuming an unprecedented complexity. This highly important social knowledge must be communicated to the masses through the medium of school-instruction in the social sciences, and it must be communicated with certain specific examples and applications. Everybody should learn that man's political relationships are not immutably fixed, that reformation of government is necessary and possible, that the Constitution of the United States is susceptible of amendment, that even the national state is not necessarily a final or supreme form of political organization. Everybody should learn, moreover, that man's economic relationships are not irrevocably determined, that the blessing of private property should not be restricted to the few but should be extended to the many, that a more rigorous control or a more equitable distribution of wealth is desirable and practicable, that all political questions are economic and all economic questions are political. Everybody should learn, also, that man's intellectual relationships are not static or uniform, that old ideas pass away and new ones are born, that the world is full of isms of all kinds, that there are a multitude of conflicting religions and divergent ethical codes. Everybody should learn, finally, that the eventual outcome of the current flux in politics, economics, and thought is dependent in part upon changing material circumstances and in even larger part upon intelligent direction and control by human beings.

Secondly, our basic philosophy must be applied especially to the training of American children. The United States is a segment of the world and comes nearer perhaps than most other countries to presenting a complete cross-section of contemporary

human relationships about which it is our business to impart knowledge and understanding. We Americans are not certain that we are a distinctive nationality. We are certainly in a pot which at present is more obviously boiling than melting; and what eventually will come out of it no one knows. The purposeful teaching of social science in our schools can undoubtedly influence the character of the product. And it does seem to me that one great purpose of the teaching of social science in American schools should be the minimizing of friction between the various elements in our national pot. We need domestic peace. We need therefore to overcome prejudice. We need therefore to have mutual understanding. This applies alike to racial, religious, economic, and sectional groups of our population.

Our majorities should be more enlightened about our minorities: our white people about their black compatriots; our people of English antecedents about their fellow citizens of continental European stock; our religious groups about one another; our urban communities about their rural neighbors; capitalists about workingmen; the north about the south; the east about the west. In this modern age of flux, our people should be taught that any minority of today may be a majority of tomorrow, that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. That we have hundreds of different kinds of Americans should be a source of real pride, instead of shame, among us. But the price we must pay for it is the assurance of mutual understanding, amity, and justice between the many groups that comprise America. Such assurance the teaching of social science should seek to give.

The teaching of social science should involve not only the imparting of knowledge but also a certain amount of indoctrination. "Indoctrination"—that is the word, and I mean it. I don't mean that any teacher should be encouraged or even free to indoctrinate his students with every idea of economics, politics, and religion which he himself entertains. I do mean, however, that the public should expect, and every teacher should strive, to have the rising generation indoctrinated during their school-course with the general philosophy which I have set forth earlier in this paper and likewise with the ideas that they live in a changing world and that they labor in a country in which mutual understanding among groups is required. The fundamental indoctrination, in a word,

should be that of toleration, not the toleration of indifference but the toleration of reason, a genuine respect for the opinions of others without any obligation to share them.

It should also be a purpose of social-science instruction to prepare the coming generation for greater appreciation of, and better citizenship in, not only the nation, but also a particular locality or district, and the world at large. Patriotism must be purified and humbled. It should doubtless, like charity, begin at home, but home is not necessarily an artificially constructed national state nor is it any place on the earth's surface where some fellow-national flies a flag or owns an oil-well. Home is home, and normally, even in our rapidly changing world, it is the locality of one's birth or residence. If a man is a good citizen of his own community, he is apt to be a good member of his nation. And it should be a special function of social-science instruction in our schools to make clear that a man who has the welfare of his country and community intelligently at heart must be informed about other nations of the world and prepared to extend the same amity and justice to foreigners as he assures to his folks at home.

Really to understand the present and to prepare intelligently for the future, it is vitally necessary to have some knowledge and appreciation of the past. We cannot realize what a changing world we live in today unless we compare and contrast it with the worlds in which our grandfathers and our much more distant forbears lived. We cannot measure the significance to groups in our midst of their convictions and customs unless we know something of how such convictions and customs originated and developed. We cannot appreciate the difficulty of indoctrinating the coming generation with reasoned toleration unless we know the painful past record of toleration. We cannot love humbly our community, our nation, or foreign peoples unless we know something of their history, their old faults as well as their old virtues. At almost every point, therefore, social science most include history. History is far more important in a dynamic than in a static world, and it should be a major objective of our teaching to chart the dynamic progress of human relationships in time as well as in space.

Another objective of social-science teaching, another matter of "indoctrination" if you like, should be the development in our

people of a greater appreciation of beauty and grace and politeness. Human relationships in America would be improved if we should set out with a will to teach true politeness and a real regard for the personal dignity of our neighbor. In America, too, we tend to rate very highly the immediately useful, no matter how ugly it may be, and to regard the beautiful—aesthetics in general—as an unnecessary and freakish frill which concerns only a few women's clubs and a few denizens of our Greenwich Villages. It is pre-eminently for social-science instruction to redress the balance between material and aesthetic values. History should be of art quite as much as of political institutions and material inventions. Civics should inculcate a critical attitude toward town-planning and national architecture as well as toward community-chests and national taxation. Economics should concern itself with the appearance, as well as with the functioning, of fields, factories, and work-shops. English literature and great foreign literature should be treated more and more as proper material for that social science which shall be at once sound and fine.

What of social science is taught should be taught thoroughly, at least as thoroughly as determined teachers can devise. We have at the present time in our schools too many hasty survey courses, we teach too many little bits of this and that, we convey too many vague and fleeting impressions, so that, while we may open some students' minds, we leave most of them pretty empty. It is far better, in my opinion, to give students one thing thoroughly than to give them many things sketchily. Certainly, America as a whole needs to learn the lesson of thoroughness; and I know of no better place to begin than in the social-science class-rooms of our schools.

One reason why we are not thorough is because we are dealing with mass-education and are trying to give all children everything which any of them should or might be given. The result is not only that we teach children a very little about a good many things but also that we tend to establish too much uniformity at a rather low level of mentality and information. We talk about social science or social knowledge as if "social" were the all-important word in the phrase. We seem to think that if children are "socialized"— if they conform to current conventions of the majority— it is final proof that they have learned the lesson of social science.

I beg to differ with this estimate of the purpose of social science. Both "socialized" and individualistic modes of thinking are persistent elements in human experience, and one of our most pressing problems is that of adjustment to a world in which neither can be left out of account. To my way of thinking, the ultimate objective in the teaching of social science, as in all teaching, is, or should be, the development of personality, of individualism, of liberty. We do not want the America of the future a dead-level of mediocrity. We do not want a whole nation of "socialized" followers, without leaders in a wide variety of human endeavor. We want leaders more than followers, and leaders who have character and ability. To this end the teaching of social science must be directed. For social science involves an understanding not only of society but of the place of the individual in society, and its exponents should labor to develop and train the individual, and particularly the exceptional individual.

I confess to being what in many quarters today is deemed old-fashioned. I am a liberal. I believe sincerely and wholeheartedly in according to every one the greatest amount of liberty compatible with the liberty of others. I detest coercion by Fascists, by Bolshevists, by capitalists, by military or electoral majorities. I would have my countrymen return to the teaching of Thomas Jefferson in this respect and to the practise of the real toleration which should proceed from that teaching; I would even have them proclaim anew, as all the founders of this nation originally proclaimed, the solemn right of revolution against tyranny. This is my final personal suggestion to you in determining objectives for courses and curricula in social science.

Carlton J. H. Hayes

THE VANISHED NATURALIST

The differentiation of professional species in the United States, that is the splitting off of specialists as numbers increase with the passing of time, is one important indication of the growth of civilization with the country. Considered by the historian it is, indeed, one of the tests which can be applied to any age or generation to determine how far civilization has proceeded. This generalization[1] can be more clearly understood if one takes a particular example, say the naturalists.

At the time of the Revolution the naturalist had not been thrown off in this country to be a separate person by himself. He was a part of other people, we shall see, principally doctors. Only in recent years had he been apprehended to exist at all, even in this very imperfectly detached stage. In original contributions to scientific knowledge certainly the next half century was not distinguished; not only was there no considerable corps of productive scientists, but it happened that no genius appeared comparable to Franklin or possibly even Rittenhouse in the previous era. Most histories of science find it unnecessary to mention America at all from the seventeen eighties to the eighteen thirties.

Yet the period is important to the social historian, marked as it is by an extraordinary spread of scientific curiosity. Americans wanted science, and at the end of the eighteenth century they realized that little progress had been made; it had been retarded, as the *Literary Magazine* remarked, because American interests had for some time been "swallowed up in the gulph of politics." Though most of our scientific ideas were brought from Europe—in geology we debated the rival theories of a Scotchman and a German, in biology the rival classifications of a Swede and various Frenchmen—it is quite as important to know that they found a general hospitality. They were not imported here for a small and artificial market as they were into Russia by Catherine the Second's exotic academy.

[1] D. R. Fox, "A Synthetic Principle for American History," *American Historical Review*, xxxv, 256-266.

Up to about 1817 or 1818 our science was cultivated as an accomplishment by amateurs, men who had not been trained to the scientific habit of thought, men who were true representatives of a people who could solve these problems with a little information and plain common sense. Scientific interest occupied the spare time of some clergymen like the Reverend Manasseh Cutler of Ipswich, the first native writer on botany in New England, the Reverend Louis D. von Schweinitz, the Moravian, our first important mycologist, who sought mushrooms with scarcely less avidity than human souls, the Reverend H. E. Muhlenberg who wrote on cryptogams and his neighbor, the Reverend F. E. Melsheimer who showed the same concern for insects and became the first American entomologist. Sometimes there was a lawyer with a similar hobby, like the jurist-politician, Augustus B. Woodward, so important in the history of Michigan, who gained great respect in 1801 for his logical demonstration that the sun was made of what he called the "substance of electricity" and in 1816 published a *System of Universal Science.*

Now and again a country gentleman, or in the spacious phrase of that day "a landed proprietor of liberal sentiment," took up science, like Stephen Elliot, the Georgia planter, remembered as the father of botany in the South, and Humphrey Marshall, the Pennsylvanian, whose character as farmer may be guessed from the circumstance that near his house he set up an astronomical observatory and a botanical garden. But bad farming may be forgiven a man who was in one of his phases the first American dendrologist. But best of all such examples was Thomas Jefferson, whose *Notes on Virginia* (1782) contain the first scientific survey of a locality in America. When he went to Philadelphia as Vice President he took with him the bones of a prehistoric monster to articulate; while in 1801 Congress wrangled as to whether he or Aaron Burr would be President, he found time to correspond with Dr. Wistar on the excavation of the mastodon in the Shawangunk Hills of New York; while the country rang with controversy over the embargo, he could have been found in a great unfurnished room of the Executive Mansion sorting out three hundred bones that he had recently received from Big Bone Lick, Kentucky. He made contributions, too, to other sciences.

But it must not be thought that this increased his prestige in all quarters, for example, in New England. Bryant reflecting the prevailing sentiment in Cummington, Massachusetts, well indicated this in his poem "The Embargo". "Go", this thirteen year-old boy told Thomas Jefferson:

> Go, wretch, resign the Presidential chair,
> Disclose thy secret measures foul or fair,
> Go search with curious eye for horned frogs,
> Mid the wild wastes of the Louisianian bogs,
> Or, where the Ohio rolls its turbid stream,
> Dig for huge bones, thy glory and thy theme.

As has been said, however, the rudimentary naturalist was long to be sought for within the doctor. It is not surprising, therefore, that the *American Medical Repository* served incidentally as the best general scientific magazine for twenty years after its foundation in 1798. Among its monthly readers were such men as Timothy Dwight, James Kent and DeWitt Clinton, because they desired such scientific crumbs as fell from the doctors' table. On the other hand, when in 1825 Dr. Richard Harlan published his *Fauna Americana*, the first American book on zoology, nearly half of his subscribers were medical men. The first mineralogical journal was founded by one doctor, and the first mineralogical society by another. It was perfectly appropriate for the Philadelphia Medical Society to offer a prize in 1801 for the best natural history of any state. Most natural science taught to that generation was offered in the medical schools and credited toward a medical degree. In 1800, apparently, no one taught chemistry in the United States who had not that professional rating. When in 1806 Yale College desired to confer a distinction upon Robert Hare, the Philadelphia brewer who had invented the oxyhydrogen blowpipe, it was natural to select an honorary M. D.

At this time no college thought of giving a full course in geology or mineralogy, but in that they were not behind the mother country. "I found there," wrote Silliman describing London in 1805, "no school[1] public or private for geological instruction and no association for cultivation of the subject, which was not named in the English universities." No one could train then for general

[1]We would say "course".

science as a career. A little later in the second decade of the nineteenth century, when the naturalist began to stand out by himself, he was usually a mature man who had followed some other calling. Amos Eaton practiced law until the age of forty before he set out to maintain himself as an itinerant lecturer on nature; William Maclure had reached about the same age as a merchant before he gave his time and fortune to the cause of science. Parker Cleaveland, who had graduated from Harvard without realizing that there was more than one kind of rock in the earth but who later was to write the first American text on mineralogy, was a teacher of mathematics at Bowdoin in 1807. Lumbermen blasting for a sluiceway in the neighboring town of Topsham having come upon some glittering stones and being anxious not carelessly to throw away diamonds or gold brought specimens to the professor as a learned man. By industrious inquiry in available books he discovered that he had not diamonds but a new and fascinating lifework.

Neither doctors nor others who took natural science as a sideline were necessarily to be content with that, and, indeed, it sometimes looks as though the doctor was but partly branched off from the learned man rather than the scientist had not wholly branched off from the doctor. Not enough was known about anything to dismay any "curious and ingenious gentleman" who sought to make suggestions. Let us take as an example Dr. Samuel Latham Mitchill. A reporter in the *New York Times* for October 8, 1926, writing of the Erie Canal Centennial Celebration observed that someone read parts of a speech "made by a Mr. Mitchell at the time". So obscurely tucked away in history is one who was hailed in his own day as the leading man of science in America! Of Dr. Mitchill it once was said: "He was equally at home studying the geology of Niagara and the anatomy of an egg; in offering suggestions on the angle of a windmill or the shape of a gridiron; in deciphering a Babylonian brick or investigating bivalves and discoursing on conchology; in advising how to apply steam to navigation or in disputing about the Bible with his neighbor, the Jewish rabbi." He was also a politician, a useful citizen, an historian, an orator. He wrote on subconscious thinking, mineralogy and icebergs—no one better—and as a chemist developed a theory of pestilential effluvia as the cause of

epidemics, contending here with his friend Noah Webster. It was characteristic of the time that he should put his science into verse as he tells how lime counteracts the poisonous vapors in his four-page poem on the Doctrine of Septon:

> You saw, ye Gnomes! Before the day was won
> Prodigious feats of chemic valour done,—
> You saw Potassa seize a Septic foe,
> His brawny arms around unclenching throw;
> And, plung'd in flames as shuddering hosts admire,
> Himself unhurt, consume the wretch by fire:—
> You saw where Calx a nitric miscreant found,
> And grip'd and pull'd and dragg'd him to the ground....

It is well enough for modern scientists to call him a chaos of knowledge, but his general scientific interest was typical of his time. Dr. Jacob Green, professor of chemistry in the Jefferson Medical College after 1822 published books on electricity, chemical philosophy, "Astronomical Recreations," trilobites (two volumes), a botany of the United States and a work on the diseases of the skin. The notable botanical researches of John Torrey, M. D., were interrupted for four years after 1824 while he served at West Point as a professor of chemistry, mineralogy and geology.

Such universality went well, as we have hinted, with a buoyant confidence that the solution of the riddle of the universe lay just around the corner. "The present period," wrote Professor Silliman in 1821, "is distinguished by wonderful mental activity; it might indeed be denominated the intellectual age of the world," —this of an American generation which Simon Newcomb in the perspective of half a century was to say had been negligible in the rise of science. A little more inquiry, they thought, and the great secret would be penetrated, as may be illustrated in some scientists we have mentioned. Dr. Muhlenberg wrote Dr. Cutler in 1792, proposing a final summation of American descriptive botany. Let Cutler make a flora for New England; Michaux for South Carolina and Georgia; Kramsch, North Carolina; Greenway, Virginia and Maryland; Barton, New Jersey, Delaware and the lower parts of Pennsylvania; Bartram, Marshall and himself the rest of that

state; and Mitchill, New York. Then let young Dr. Barton weave them all together into a complete flora for the United States. "How pleasant it would be for the botanical world!" Richard Harlan in his *Fauna Americana* observes that naturalists have "nearly perfected the departments of American ornithology, conchology and entomology." Amos Eaton in his textbook on zoology published the following year says, "If every student will contribute his mite by sending to Mr. Say duplicates of all undescribed species, we shall be in possession of a system, very nearly complete in a few years".

Society did not assume support of the naturalist merely out of curiosity as to the riddle of the universe, but because of his practical utility. Ideally the scientist should be as much pleased by the discovery of gold in the composition of the moon as in that of his own backyard, but such scientists even now are rare. One who glances through the medical magazines is impressed with the demand for discoveries useful in medicine or the arts. A nation, quite obviously, must know its own minerals before it can use them. "Already," wrote Jacob Green in 1814, "many plants which were noticed as desiderata for American cultivation, and which twenty years ago were esteemed exotic, are now found growing in our fields and forests." It was on these terms that society was willing to support the man of science.

A certain amount of support came, too, from a concern to be independent of England not only in such economic matters but in general culture. While we were colonials, wrote the Charleston doctor, J. L. E. W. Shecut in 1817, this cultural deference might have seemed appropriate, "but since our emancipation from [the condition of] the petty slaves of royalty to that of free men and citizens of the only and greatest republic on earth, nothing can extenuate, no excuses can even palliate the gross and shameful neglect of the arts, sciences and literature among us". Incidentally the discussions of our scientists constantly piled up effective refutation of the prevalent European view that all nature—plants, animals and oven rocks—grew weaker in the New World. The desire for cultural independence was an important if not the dominant idea of the period and its influence on American science was wholly fortunate.

If patriotism came to the support of science, no less did piety. Had the scientist in his early development thought it necessary to crowd the clergymen, then so stout and stubborn a branch, the presumptuous shoot might well have been suppressed. Jeffersonian science was suspected as deistic; doubtless Say, Lesueur, Troost, Maclure and other scientists who joined in the New Harmony experiment also raised the eyebrows of the orthodox, and Noah Webster's imported doctrine of equivocal or spontaneous generation had to be refuted from Holy Writ. But the great majority of scientific men were sound and solid on the scriptures. Amos Eaton pointed out that there were gratifying coincidences between geology and the Bible, but, said he, "I do not pretend that the coincidence is alone sufficient or at all necessary to support the authenticity of Divine revelation." The doctrine that the Almighty had put nothing on the earth but what would serve the use of man naturally suggested that man should systematically survey these assets. "To man," said Dr. Mitchill, "on the sixth day was given for meat every herb that is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed." George Turner, one of our first paleontologists summed up in 1798 the purpose of nature: ,'The Author of existence is wise and just in all his works, He never confers an appetite without the power of gratifying it."

The kind of science which that generation cultivated was what is technically known as systematic; when you classified a work of nature you completed your responsibility. All that was needed, to quote Dr. Mitchill once more, was "a happy talent for inquiry and observation." Science had left the arm-chair, speculative stage and was in that of active conscientious field work; after observation of nature as it lay *in situ* came induction and classification according to Linnaeus' system, all in the best tradition of the eighteenth century. "One of the most remarkable improvements of the recent century," said the *Literary Magazine* in 1804, "is the practice of reducing the whole body of human knowledge into a comprehensive and systematic order." This required scholarship as well as ingenuity, C. S. Rafinesque, the most prolific naturalist of the day, was also the most annoying through a habit of christening and announcing everything he newly came upon, with little concern as to whether it had been

observed and named by someone else before. This apostle of confusion laid up a mighty list of names of things on earth before he started in to classify the clouds.

Except in chemistry experiment, that is arranged observation, was, at least in some important quarters, actually suspect. "There is reason to believe," declared the *Medical Repository* in 1800, "that too much time and talent have been spent within the last twenty years, in making experiments devised, and often very badly, by the human head. Nature is the best experimenter.... To observe and interpret nature is the way to be truly wise and scientific." But a laboratory, we must reflect, requires delicate and efficient instruments, especially in many departments the microscope. Not much could be done in the laboratory study of natural structure until the invention of the achromatic microscope in the thirties; at any rate in the preceding years investigators often had to construct their own instruments of magnification and at the beginning of the period, about 1790, the instruments was a curiosity, a show. "A solar microscope" was advertised to be exhibited at the home of Christopher Colles, near the Battery in New York, which would magnify a common louse to the apparent length of twelve feet. Patrons of science attracted by this opportunity obtained it for three York shillings.

The great age of field work which opened in the last years of the eighteenth century may be considered as the heroic period of American science; the scientist was visibly heroic. No Coronado plumed and panoplied astride his charger could more fill the imagination than this successor who conquered not for royal master but for the human mind. André Michaux, penetrating the deep-shaded streams of Florida in a cypress dugout, trudging in solitary silence for nine hundred miles through the pathless western wilds of Carolina and Georgia, the natural perils of the forest increased by roving bands of hostile Indians quite unacquainted with the scientific spirit; William Maclure with bag and hammer and thick-soled shoes crossing the Alleghany Mountains fifty times,—these quicken the blood for action as well as hold respect for thought. "The drudgery of climbing cliffs and descending into fissures and caverns and of traversing the most rugged mountains has developed upon me," wrote Eaton; he tells us that he travelled ten thousand miles largely on foot. Pursh, the botanist,

claimed a record of "more than three thousand miles each season, with no other companion than my dog and gun, frequently taking up my lodgings in the midst of wild mountains and impenetrable forests, far from the habitations of men." Elisha Mitchell and Denison Olmsted in North Carolina, Vanuxem in New York, Hitchcock in Massachusetts, all could furnish a like account. If the sophisticated academic scholar would have tales of high emprise, enthusiasm, fortitude, bold physical strength, let him turn to the annals of American science a hundred years ago when almost every discoverer had to fight his battle with the wilderness.

Even at home the naturalist faced forbidding obstacles. "No one in Europe," wrote Stephen Elliot to Dr. Hooker in London, "can, probably, appreciate correctly the difficulty of the task in which I have engaged. The want of books, the want of opportunities for examining living collections or good herbaria, the want of coadjutors, have all seemed to render my task arduous and multiply its imperfections."

The breaking off of the naturalist from the medical man was recognized and marked in 1818 by the establishment of Silliman's *Journal*, but even yet it was doubted that the new professional could in himself support a magazine; it was entitled the *American Journal of Science and Arts* and printed a little now and then on painting, sculpture and letters. In the seventeen nineties, as we have seen, there was little or no attention paid in colleges to scientific interests. "Our education at Princeton," in after years wrote a member of the class of 1792, "was shamefully and inexcusably deficient in experimental Philosophy." "How deeply it is to be regretted," exclaimed the *Medical Repository* as late as 1808, "that the knowledge of those things of which the Creator has formed the world we inhabit, should be so generally neglected in fashionable seminaries of learning, and be considered as of low value in what is called a liberal education!"

College presidents of vision, however, like Bishop Madison of William and Mary and Timothy Dwight of Yale made a place for the subject in their curricula. By 1811, Harvard, Columbia and the University of Pennsylvania had college professorships in natural history; by the latter twenties it was customary. The professor, of course, was a naturalist in general and gave a "survey course." One of the last acts of Thomas Jefferson's life was to

lay out the course that the new professor of natural history was to give at the University of Virginia in 1826. It was to consist of one hundred and forty-four lectures on botany, zoology, mineralogy, geology, chemistry and miscellaneous, twenty-four on each.

But well before 1830 the naturalist, who had thus broken off from the doctor, was beginning, both within and without the academic field, to break up himself. When about that time the state surveys were organized the complement was not several naturalists, but a geologist, a botanist, a zoologist, etc. The process has gone on until we scarcely have geologists today, but geo-physicists, petrologists, stratigraphists, paleobotanists, physiographers and others. In biological evolution the parent species usually persists unaffected by the fact that a variety has broken off; but this is not so generally true in social evolution, where a species often seems itself to disintegrate. We can speak today, perhaps with a playful touch of extravagance, of the vanished naturalist.

In 1800 there were three societies or academies where savants might meet and talk on any phase of science and be understood. By 1817 there were about a dozen more, but fewer were founded as the years went by. The Association for the Advancement of Science, begun in 1847, is now a vast federation of special groups. A few learned bodies like the oldest, the American Philosophical Society, still maintain their range, but learning is not much advanced in the general meetings of most such institutes, if indeed a quorum can be found. The History of Science Society surveys the general growth of scientific interest, but it is made up more of historians than of scientists. The further back we look the less real science the historian has to know. To peer in upon this province from outside and modestly attempt to trace its relations with other interests of the common life may be a function of the social historian; for in the evolution of professional species the social historian is a specialist in generalization. In closing I may say, what scarcely needs be said, that he is often wrong.

DIXON RYAN FOX

ATLANTIC CITY MEETING

November 29, 1930

Saturday Morning, November 29, 10:00 o'clock, Viking Room, Haddon Hall.

GENERAL TOPIC: *"Experimentation in Testing in Social Studies."*

a. Mr. W. G. Kimmel, Executive Secretary of the Commission of the American Historical Association on the Social Studies in the Schools.

b. Miss Marion G. Clark, Department of Education, Montclair, N. J.

Saturday Afternoon, November 29, 1:00 o'clock, Derbyshire Room, Haddon Hall.

ADDRESS: *"Our World Neighbors"*, Mr. James G. McDonald, Chairman of the Foreign Policy Association.

EXPERIMENTATION IN TESTING IN THE SOCIAL STUDIES:

SOME PROBLEMS AND IMPLICATIONS

The subject proposed for discussion is so broad and includes so many crucial problems and difficulties in presentation that it is possible to attempt to discuss the entire situation, to consider only certain problems and difficulties, or to become involved in details of individual tests. It is with a due sense of the scope of the field and some hesitation that the speaker approaches this discussion, and he regards the assignment to be to raise problems concerning experimentation in testing in the social studies, not to attempt to answer them; to raise question concerning some of the assumptions underlying and surrounding the problems and difficulties in experimentation in testing, not to pass judgment upon the validity and applicability of the assumptions. Experimentation in testing in the social studies, despite the increasing attention devoted to it, has not passed beyond the introductory stages, even though many phases of the field have been rather hastily explored and exploited. It seems impossible, on the basis of available evidence, to speak with certainty or finality concerning most of the problems and difficulties which will be outlined briefly.

The materials in this discussion are centered about the following considerations: (1) the setting of the present situation of testing in the social studies, (2) a restatement of some of the more important problems and perplexities which are encountered in the construction and use of standardized and unstandardized tests, and, (3) a brief formulation of some of the criticisms and broader implications of the testing movement for instruction in the social studies. There is not sufficient time for a discussion of the details of specific tests now available, nor for a restatement of the results of experimentation completed to date. It is also assumed that the problems encountered are similar for all the subjects which comprise the social studies.

In the short period of a quarter of a century since Binet reported his first work with intelligence testing and Rice reported results of simple educational tests, the testing movement has developed by leaps and bounds, with varying degrees of promise and success in different fields of endeavor. The rapidity of the development of the testing movement in social studies has resulted in the construction of tests which apparently vary widely in merit, and in findings based on the use of tests which cannot always be accepted without reservations. Many problems have been turned up which are still pressing for possible solution. The testing movement has been explored through the construction of tests, many of which have been devised by persons trained in the technical phases of the work, but not always conversant with values in subject matter which accrue through years of training and constant use of content materials of the social sciences. Many of the claims made for individual tests have not always been substantiated in practical use. Investigations and experiments in the social studies have been reported in increasing numbers, based primarily on scores on standardized and unstandardized tests, with findings set forth in many instances without reservations concerning what is actually measured by the tests used. Some competently-trained teachers and specialists in the social studies become somewhat alarmed concerning the apparently extravagant advantages claimed for the tests and in the degree of finality with which results of experimentation based on the use of tests have been set forth. All of these elements, of course, are found in any rapidly developing field of endeavor. There seems at present to be a decline of interest in the testing movement in the social studies, a certain disillusionment which naturally may be expected to follow a period of rapid development and the enthusiastic claims made by protagonists of the movement when compared with the older essay type of examinations, an appreciation of the many problems and perplexities involved in testing in the social studies, which seem in some cases to have been ignored or considered only casually by the early workers in the field, and a disposition to take stock of the progress which has been made as well as to evaluate results in a more critical manner in terms of recognized objectives of instruction in the social studies.

Much of the present uncertainty in experimentation with tests, to say nothing of some shortcomings in past efforts, centers about the baffling problems in the technical set-up of new types of standardized tests. There is now considerable agreement that the technical problems involved in the construction of tests for the social studies are more difficult than in some other subjects, and that they have been attacked with relatively less success. What mental process is a specified test devised to measure or sample? To what extent or degree does it actually measure what it purports to measure? Can a particular test be successfully administered a second time to the same group of pupils? These and other questions can be considered in a number of ways, and a brief outline of some of the problems is presented with the hope that the apparent over-simplification of the issues involved will be more serviceable for purposes of later discussion by this group than an involved technical presentation.

In the literature on the construction of standardized tests three points of reference are constantly in view and discussed at considerable length. These points of reference are: validity, reliability, and objectivity. In one sense these canons for guidance in the construction of tests can be ignored only at the peril of becoming bogged in technical uncertainties, and in the completion of tests of doubtful worth. Even though these points of reference are regarded as highly important, some standardized tests in the social studies have until recently been developed without regard to them, and most unstandardized tests seem to be constructed without considering them at all. In view of the importance which is rightfully attached to these concepts of validity, reliability,and objectivity, it may be desirable to examine them briefly in terms of tests in the social studies.

Validity has been defined "as the correspondence between the ability measured by the test and ability as otherwise objectively defined and measured. When a test really measures what it purports to measure and consistently measures this same something throughout the entire range of the test it is a valid test."[1] In

[1]William A. McCall, *How to Measure in Education*, 195. See discussion by T. L. Kelley, *Interpretation of Educational Measurements*, 13-14, 29-30.

other words, validity is concerned with the extent to which a given test actually measures what it purports to measure. This is the crux of the major problem in the testing movement in the social studies. What does a particular test measure?[2] The methods used to validate standardized tests in the social studies may throw some light on the problem, and the data on methods commonly used, as assembled by Peters,[3] are reproduced in a slightly modified form.

Textbooks Analysis	13
Pooled Judgment of Competent Persons	8
Correlation with School Marks	6
Correlation with Previously Validated Measures	5
Analysis of Courses of Study	3
Empirical Tryout	3
Increase of Percentages of Success with Successive Ages of Grade	2
Logical or Psychological Analysis	2
Items Selected for Difficulty	2
Determination of Social Utility—Scientific Job Analysis	2
Correlation between Parts of the Test, Each Part Testing for Different Features	1
Determination of Social Utility on Basis of General Aims	1
Correlation with Teacher's Ratings	1
Agreement with Observation of Individuals	1
Total Number of Tests	18

The most used method of validation—in thirteen out of eighteen standardized tests—is the analysis of textbooks. In American schools the analysis of textbooks probably affords a fairly reliable index of what is being taught in the schools, but the relationships between the materials found in textbooks and the significant processes in daily living are not always clear. Textbooks for a

[2]A. C. Krey, "What Does the New-Type Examination Measure in History?" *Historical Outlook*, XIX (Apr. 1, 1928), 159-62, contains a useful survey of experience and experimentation at the college level.

[3]C. C. Peters, in *Objectives in Education* (Second Yearbook, National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology), 152-53.

given subject, within certain limits, are very much alike, the main points of difference being variations in the organization of subject matter. There seems to be considerable agreement that textbooks contain much inert material, agreed upon through continued use, and that there is a considerable lag between new materials and findings unearthed through research and the content of textbooks. Publishers are said to be reluctant to publish materials which do not seem familiar to teachers and for which there is unlikely to be a ready market. At best, no materials are included which are likely to arouse any antagonisms. If tests are constructed from materials generally found in textbooks and validated by this method, they are likely to include many conventional and inert items which bear the stamp of custom and tradition rather than "live" materials which conform more closely to results of researches and investigations expressed in so far as possible in terms meaningful to pupils. This need for the use of up-to-date content is particularly important in tests of social studies other than history. Thus tests validated through analyses of textbooks, even though only items of most educational worth are used, are likely to represent only a part of the total panorama of social experience.

The second most-used method of validation of social-studies tests is the pooled judgment of competent persons. If competency implies persons adequately trained in content materials, the method holds forth possibilities. Competent persons may be more circumscribed in writing textbooks than in furnishing critical judgments as to the worth of items for the purposes of testing. There is, however, the question of competency in different situations and of different degrees of competency in the same situation. One may be competent presumably in the selection of subject matter of inherent worth for a test, but lacking in discrimination in the selection of test items directed toward a sampling of the abilities needed for harmonious living. Again, there are certain difficulties in the use of pooled judgments in the construction of tests. In the development of information tests in the social studies, the pooled judgments of several competent persons may eliminate the most significant items of information tabulated in terms of frequency of mention, leaving a residue of relatively unimportant items upon which there is general agreement to form

the body of the test. This is particularly likely if several forms of the test are desired. The available information is not stabilized, and the number of worthwhile test items in a given body of material is limited. Consequently, if this method of validation is used to the exclusion of all other methods, the information tests may be fool-proof from a technical standpoint, but they may or may not be significant in terms of content.

Another method of validation is the correlation of tests with school marks, teachers' ratings, and the like. While the past record of pupils are undeniably a reasonable index of probable future performance, this method of validation seems to present a contradiction in procedures. One of the most persistent claims made for the new-type tests is their objectivity in use, and this element of superiority over the essay type of examination has been cited repeatedly. Teachers' marks and their ratings of examinations have been demonstrated to be relatively subjective, and are regarded by some as unreliable indices of classroom performance. But despite this apparent subjectivity, these same criteria are used to validate tests which purport to be objective. Again, if teacher ratings are to be used, much depends upon whether teachers competently trained in subject matter make the ratings. This method of validation, furthermore, does not make a contribution to answer the basic question as to what abilities are to be measured. It seems to involve the use of methods regarded by some as unreliable from the standpoint of objectivity in the approximation of validity.

The progressive increase in scores on a given test at subsequent higher grade levels is another method of validation of test items. This method likewise does not answer the question: What does the test measure? It does indicate a progressive improvement of pupils in the answering of test items at higher grade levels, in terms of whatever the test measures. Other methods of validation of test items in the social studies are used less frequently than those mentioned, and apparently with less certainty in results.

The problems[4] involved in the validation of materials seem to result from confusion, in some instances at least, between the

[4]Since this paper was written, A. S. Barr, in "Measurement and Progressive Education" (Editorial), *Journal of Educational Research*, XXII (Nov., 1930), 317-19, has pointed out some of the implications of these problems.

objectives of instruction in the social studies and the particular mental process or processes which the test is intended to sample or to measure in terms of pupil performance, between technical and objective methods for ascertaining whether a test measures what it purports to measure and relative values in content, which apparently are subjective and difficult to bring under the control of so-called objective techniques. It is apparent from the experience of persons who have constructed standardized tests in the social studies that greater difficulties in validation are present than in the case of subjects in which the materials are more stabilized, the goals of instruction more adequately defined, and the connection between ability and performance more definitely established. Tests for telephone operators, mechanics, and other trades and occupations can be devised with considerable assurance of a direct relationship between ability displayed on performance on a test and on the job, but in the social studies there is no assurance of the possibility or desirability for the establishment of such relationships.

Closely allied with problems and methods of validating tests are problems concerning their reliability and objectivity. The reliability of a test is defined by McCall as "The amount of agreement between results secured from two or more applications of the test to the same pupils by the same examiner,"[5] while the objectivity of a test is concerned with the amount of agreement secured by different examiners in applications of the test to the same pupils. Without going into the applications of statistical techniques, it may be said that the principal ways used to overcome chance causes of unreliability are increasing the number of items in the test, averaging results through repeated use of the test preferably in duplicate forms, or a combination of these methods. Difficulties are usually encountered in the use of both methods in the construction of tests in the social studies. As indicated above, the number of suitable and apparently significant available items is often limited, especially if the content to be drawn upon covers a limited field or period. Two forms of a test in the social studies of approximately equal merit and degree of difficulty seem to necessitate more study and painstaking labor than in similar tests in some other subjects. The use of the self-

[5]William A. McCall, *op. cit.*, 307.

correlation method—the computing of the correlation between two series of scores made by the same pupils on the same or duplicate forms of a test or between parts of a test—does not always result in high correlations,[6] and in the effort to obtain high correlations, there is danger of the elimination of all but the more obvious types of test items. In other words, the more difficult and complex the content and the form of the test items, the more baffling, all other things being equal, is the construction of a test from the standpoint of reliability. In short, there are a series of problems involved in obtaining the highest possible degree of reliability without sacrificing items of worth and merit in the construction of standardized tests in the social studies.

Objectivity in the use of tests by different examiners is usually attained from the standpoint of the construction of tests through the formulation of specific directions for the persons to whom the tests are administered, and in terms of scoring devices which permit no qualifications or reservations in answers. The directions, uniform in character in the several forms of the test, do not present any marked difficulties, because they are external to the test, that is, not directly concerned with the content of test items. At the same time, it is possible to limit the tasks set for pupils in terms of simplifying them to conform to directions which are brief, precise, and understandable, thereby limiting the demands made upon pupils to the extent that the test may necessitate recall and recognition of items rather than thinking. In a multiple-choice test, for example, pupils may be directed to mark the item which is correct or they may be required to mark, in addition, items partially correct, items incorrect, and items about which they are in doubt. The last type of answers may conceivably be more important than the simpler marking of one item in affording insight into the mental processes of pupils. Such directions, while they make the test immeasurably more difficult, also present

[6]For data on the reliability and validity of social-studies tests, see the summaries by: T. L. Kelley, *op. cit.*, 265-70, 334-37; Luella J. Kregel, in *Journal of Educational Research*, XX (Nov., 1929), 380-17; G. M. Ruch and Others, *Objective Examination Methods in the Social Studies*, 107-8, 111; Oliver R. Floyd, "Validity of Tests in the Social Studies," *Historical Outlook*, XX (January, 1929), 10-12; Lynn Barrett, "Six Standard Tests for the Social Studies," *University High School Journal*, VIII (November, 1928), 202-16.

problems in the objective scoring of answers. The crux of the problem, then, is that objectivity will not be obtained at the loss of pertinent evidence to be derived from tests through providing more difficult tasks which challenge the mental powers of pupils.

The considerations and problems involved in the validity, reliability, and objectivity of tests in the social studies deserve more extended discussion. The problems involved are basic to the success or failure of experimentation in testing, and they have not always received serious and critical consideration by teachers and specialists in the social studies. Too often the mere fact that tests are buttressed with a mass of statistical data is enough to result in their acceptance by competent and discriminating teachers, partly because of their lack of knowledge of statistics, even though at the same time they admit that many items in some tests seem to be of doubtful educational worth. But it may be argued that few teachers of the social studies are now engaged in the development of standardized tests, that many of them are still in doubt as to the worth of some of the tests now available as instruments for use in the improvement of instruction. Regardless of the merits of this contention, new tests are published from time to time, and while the trend is toward the publication of better tests from the standpoint of content and technical construction, some tests are still published without available data concerning their validity and reliability.[7] Teachers of the social studies, it seems, should be sufficiently familiar with the technical phases in the construction of tests to check up on the tests through actual use and through a careful evaluation of results. But even more important, they should be able to check tests carefully in terms of what they purport to measure and the type and worth of content from which the test items are drawn, because it is conceivable that a test may conform to high technical standards and yet be lacking in discrimination in the choice of test items. Teachers with a competent command of subject matter will also be likely to devise better tests for their own use if they have a working command of the technical phases of test construction.

Viewing the construction of tests in the social studies now from the standpoint of content rather than techniques of construction,

[7]See data in Luella J. Kregel, *op. cit.*, 308-17.

it seems imperative that the objectives of instruction, upon which there is general agreement, be kept constantly in view. There is general agreement that there are certain unique contributions which the social studies may make to the education of children, such as a realization of the contributions made by past ages to the building of the present conditions of life, insights and appreciations of the major features of contemporary life, development of abilities, skills, and aptitudes which are believed to be desirable and essential for the individual in dealing with social situations, the development of critical attitudes, and the acquiring of an increasing knowledge together with power to apply it in daily living. When the available standardized tests in the social studies are considered in the light of the broad general objectives for instruction, there seem to be wide gaps between the content of some of the tests and the objectives.

Many of the tests seem to be concerned with only the simpler and easier types of content, and a majority of them include a large proportion of items which require no more than retention and recall of information. Because of the lack of stabilized information and the lack of agreement upon subject matter—events, dates, personages, facts, episodes, situations,[8]—selected with a view to the approximation of objectives, many of the tests seem to contain too large a proportion of minute details which are of little inherent worth and are not always emphasized in courses of study. The question, "What is a fact?" is not always easy to answer. When is a fact significant? is even more difficult to appraise. Many of the available tests seem to call for the reproducing of facts in isolation, that is, unrelated to other facts. And facts unrelated to other facts are often meaningless and inert. The limitations of space, form, and directions in the construction of tests rarely permit the development of relationships which are large in scope. Even items which require the association of dates-events, personages-events, and personages-dates involve recognition and recall rather than sustained thinking on the part of pupils. A basic problem, in short, is the selection of pertinent, useful, and significant facts for use as test items.

[8]R. M. Tryon, "Standard and New Type Tests in the Social Studies," *Historical Outlook*, XVIII (April, 1927), 177.

Even more formidable problems in content are involved in the construction of tests which purport to measure the ability of pupils to use facts as the substance of thinking, to expose to view the mental processes of children, to display evidence of the development of critical attitudes in the handling of materials. In the essay type of examination the responsibility rests on the pupils to reproduce the materials used in thinking, to show their sense of the relationships between materials by the sequential order in which they are set forth, and to disclose their mental processes through selection of facts and discrimination in the organization of content. In the construction of standardized tests, on the other hand, the person so engaged is compelled to exercise the utmost ingenuity and resourcefulness in the selection of items and in the form in which they are set up. The pupils disclose their mental processes only incidentally, if at all, because the emphasis is placed upon the end-product, the final word, phrase, sentence, or symbol which is placed at a designated point on the page. The burden of responsibility, in short, seems to be shifted from the pupil to the test-maker in the new type of test.

At the elementary-school level further difficulties are encountered in attempts to construct tests to disclose the developing mental processes of children in their ability to think and handle materials. If the objective of a test is to measure the development of a sense of evidence, test items seem to be required which include all the facts which pupils are expected to use. Such facts may be of little worth in themselves from the standpoint of the social studies, because it seems essential that they shall be simple in character in order to be understandable to children. The ability of children to handle the facts, not their basic worth, is the goal. The use of this set-up, however, contains many implications for instruction, and it is an open question as to how such tests will be received by teachers and administrators if they can be constructed. Whether the results will justify the efforts and energy expended upon them can only be ascertained through experimentation.

In addition to technical problems and problems in selection of content, there is a series of problems in the administration and scoring of tests. Many of the tests contain time limits, or in the administration of tests such factors as class periods and change

of classes from room to room impose time limits on the tests. There seems to be a premium placed upon ready answers. Often there is little time for reflection, for the weighing of alternatives, and the final arriving at conclusions as to the correct answers. The pupil who knows only enough to answer the items on a test may possibly show up to better advantage than the competent and well-informed pupil, because he will not be faced with so many alternatives, his mind will not play over as wide a range of materials, and the number of possibilities which suggest themselves will be more limited. The comprehensiveness of standardized tests—one of the stated advantages—may thus be defeated or may result in scores which are not always indicative of individual pupil performance, unless supplemented by the essay type of examination.

Children readily acquire a technique of adapting themselves to the demands of the new type information tests in that they quickly learn that a little knowledge of many things is likely to be a better preparation than a thorough command of the content. In other words, they acquire a technique for "beating the game" which varies in character from that attempted in the essay examination. When the tests are administered in such a way that pupils know the results will not count towards grades, pupils do not always display the same seriousness of purpose and energy as in regular classroom exercises, apparently because only grades and credits are the important ends, from their point of view, in our educational system. Uniformity of conditions for administering a test can be obtained for all external factors, but there is always the personal response made by the individual and this is not subject to external controls. Persons who administer tests to sophisticated pupils, who are subjected to frequent tests, are aware of the typical modes of response and the techniques which pupils develop to prepare for tests.

The scoring plans for standardized tests usually do not permit of qualification or alternatives because the scores are expected to be objectively rated. The form of the test is usually of such a nature as to provide for brief answers and objective scoring, with the aim of having the work done by clerical help. Stencils and other devices are sometimes provided in order to make the task of scoring as automatic and as expeditious as possible. The gross

scores or some system of weighting the scores are usually the desired outcomes. If norms for classes and schools and the total scores for individual pupils are the desired results, such scoring devices are adequate. But if the results are to be used for diagnostic purposes with the aim of improvement of instruction, easy and rapid scoring devices may not be entirely satisfactory. In the diagnostic use of results, the responses of each pupil to every item are desirable. It seems quite important in this case to discover reasons why pupils respond in certain ways to certain items on the test, to learn which items cause the most difficulty, and to discover the proportion of correct items to the number attempted. If the test is scored by individual items for diagnostic purposes, the task is a tedious, laborious, and expensive one, and takes as much time as the reading of the essay type of examination. While the scoring may be done by clerical help, it is desirable that teachers score some tests themselves in order to learn the technique and the types of evidence which do not find their way into the tabulations and gross scores. It is this type of scoring and tabulation for diagnostic purposes which seems to be the most important end to be attained, and this despite the emphasis upon gross scores and norms in much of the survey testing now carried forward in the schools.

Assuming that a test actually samples or measures the mental process which it purports to measure, there are still many problems in the interpretation of results. There is often much confusion at this point, particularly if the results are interpreted by persons not intimately concerned with values accruing from a wide and long-time contact with the content from which the test is drawn. There seem to be differences of opinion concerning the place of statistical treatment of data as a means of interpreting results. Some persons hold that a test may be statistically accurate and constructed with due regard for all the technical phases, and yet not yield results claimed for it. Statistical treatment of results, they hold, may disclose "misfire" items in the test, yield norms useful for comparative purposes, school by school and class by class, and other pertinent and useful relationships. Different ways of looking at the results by placing them in different relationships are afforded, but they insist that an interpretation of the results is not necessarily provided by such manipulation of

data. The interpretation may or may not be made "out of the data" as a result of their manipulation, but these persons maintain that the interpretation of data from one test may be truly significant in relation to other known data, such as results from other tests, for individual pupils and groups, and results from a variety of other sources. In other words, after the data have been treated statistically in order to bring them into manageable units, there remains the need of interpreting them in terms of content used in the test in relation to the content of courses of study, in terms of pupils and their background of interests, intelligence, training and other attainments. In other words, it is maintained that the statistical treatment of results cannot take the place of rigorous thinking, that after all the manipulation of data is completed, in turning up relationships, rigorous thinking is necessary in finding reasons for the relationships and explanations of them to the end that generalizations based on the findings may be sound and meaningful. This reiteration of the need for rigorous thinking, it is said, is necessary because there is a tendency in some of the investigations in which results on tests are used merely to cite the statistical results without interpreting what they mean in terms of the social studies.

Unstandardized Tests

It was to have been expected that the construction and use of standardized tests in the social studies would create an interest in the possibilities of the development of unstandardized tests adapted to classroom use. Many teachers have received general training in the making and use of tests, and in many school systems teachers have been encouraged to devise tests for use in measuring the performance and attainments of pupils. In some school systems such tests have entirely displaced the essay type of examination, and the results are used in part as a basis for grading the work of pupils. Many teachers have had varying degrees of success in this undertaking. For several years a collection of unstandardized tests for use in secondary schools has been made, and remarks which follow are largely based on these sample tests.

With few exceptions the unstandardized tests in the social studies constructed by teachers seem to possess all of the defects of standardized tests, with few of their virtues. The types of test

items used in unstandardized tests follow closely those used in standardized tests. The items are based on courses of study and more specifically on the textbooks used in schools in which the tests are constructed. Often there is little attempt made to devise individual tests intended to approximate specified general objectives; rather there seems to be a tendency to develop "omnibus" tests, including a variety of types of items intended to measure different mental processes. Most of the items require the retention and recall of information, and if the samples collected are typical, it seems that most teachers are concerned with informational values in the form of true-false tests. Many of the tests seem to be devised without much time for reflection and analysis of content. There seems to be a lack of recognition, in so far as may be judged from an examination of the tests, that more time is required to construct a test than is needed to write a series of questions for an essay type of examination. The number of really worthwhile test items may be limited for a particular unit, block, or chapter of subject matter for which the test is devised, and many of the sample tests collected seem to include items of doubtful educational value. It is also evident that some teachers are not concerned with technical aspects of the tests; cue phrases, leads, negative phrasing, varying length of items in multiple-choice tests, and other similar faults are found in some of the tests. There are, however, certain outstanding exceptions to the foregoing comments. In two large social-studies departments, from which sample tests were collected, every test is considered and criticized in departmental meetings before it is administered to pupils. Each test is revised in the light of results, and it again is criticized by the members of the department before it is used in revised form.

There are certain centers in which unstandardized tests in the social studies are constructed with a view to the measurement of mental processes other than retention of information. The tests devised and used in Rochester,[9] particularly those dealing with skills, are especially worthy of mention. Other large centers are also engaged in attempts to test for sense of evidence, ability to

[9]For an interesting account of experimentation in Rochester, New York, see Alice N. Gibbons, *Tests in the Social Studies* (Philadelphia: McKinley Publishing Company, 1929).

draw inferences from given facts, and ability to handle cause and effect relationships. Such efforts hold much promise for the future in terms of better tests, and in terms of thoughtful consideration of the larger problems in the improvement of instruction which may be expected to result from the experience gained through the use of tests.

To what use shall the results of unstandardized tests be put? They seem to be used for purposes of grading pupils and as a teaching device. It is probable that the latter use is the more important, although it has often been neglected by teachers. Scores are of less importance than tabulations of pupil performance on different items of the tests. Such tabulations may serve both for purposes of improving the tests and as a basis for the diagnosis of pupil difficulties. If a test is worthy of use as a teaching device, the results take on more meaning in terms of pupils performance and difficulties. The latter are useful as a check on the effectiveness of instruction, particularly if certain items are marked incorrectly by a large number of pupils.

There are, however, certain potential dangers in over-emphasis of the unstandardized information test as a teaching device. Since many of the sample tests mentioned above include a large proportion of items on minute details such as names, dates, events, and the like, there is possibility that pupils may regard their work as composed of the memorization of a series of isolated items of information. Information tests are undoubtedly a valuable device, but the criterion of educational worth must always be applied. Pupils must always acquire information as a first step in the handling of social-studies material, but the testing for the retention of information should be considered merely as the first step in the testing program. If only information tests are used, pupils may regard information as the ultimate goal, and the larger objectives of instruction in the social studies may not be approximated. The problem resolves itself into the need for a balanced testing program, but more experimental evidence seems to be needed before the component parts of a balanced program can be determined.

In the present status of the development and use of unstandardized tests, there is the danger that a selective factor may operate to defeat the use of tests as a teaching device, and to lower the

quality of instruction and pupil performance. If certain materials are stressed by the teacher, and tests are constructed without subjecting them to the criticism of colleagues, there is always the possibility that the tests may not be balanced and that the teaching-testing cycle may be circumscribed in scope and limited to the materials stressed by the teacher. If the same tests and the same materials are covered year by year, the selective factor may operate unintentionally to reduce the amount of content to be taught.

Some Larger Problems and Implications of the Testing Movement in the Social Studies

One of the most obvious characteristics of present-day educational practice, according to some critics, is the striving for efficiency, which is usually conceived to mean the expression of results of instruction in units which can be catalogued, manipulated, and blue-printed. When such efforts are made by persons of vision and sound training, and with due regard to the results as a means to an end, there is likely to be little cause for objection. But analyses of results should be followed by a synthesis and an interpretation in terms of the larger aspects of educational practice. In the striving of school people for definiteness and efficiency, the testing movement, it is said, with all of its advertised advantages fits admirably into the scheme of things. If the testing movement results in the solution of the larger and more difficult problems in the teaching of the social studies, much progress will be made; but, on the other hand, if it is centered on those phases of instruction and those materials which can be readily manipulated in the construction of tests without due regard to the larger objectives of the social studies, and if the result on such tests are permitted to scale down the objectives and the content of courses of study, there is likely to be much confusion and more uncertainty.

Testing in the social studies, it is said, can be considered only in terms of the entire educational process. With the present tendency to formulate objectives in terms of specific abilities which seem to imply conditioned responses on the part of pupils, with minimum essentials in content, with tests intended to measure the degree of success which pupils attain in handling minimum

essentials—usually in terms of information retained, with the development of a disposition to modify content in courses of study in terms of results obtained from testing, there is a danger that the whole procedure may follow a circle which leads to mediocrity.[10] It is possible that such a procedure may fail to challenge the best efforts of the more capable pupils, may leave untouched large bodies of pertinent and useful content, and may result in mistaking what appear to be results for valid educational products. Some capable and discriminating teachers of the social studies seem to view with increasing concern what they regard as the substitution of the symbol for the substance, the token for the coin, the ephemeral for the real. These teachers maintain that many of the lasting values that accrue from the study of the social studies cannot be tested, that such values do not fall within categories which can be measured by the tests devised to date. They insist that many of the available standardized tests used in surveys are centered upon information values, that as a result of the use of such tests as well as unstandardized tests many teachers give the major part of their time in the classroom to having pupils acquire information, when results obtained in experiments and investigations indicate that information as such is quickly forgotton by pupils. Teachers, these critics maintain, are in a rather indefensible position when results on survey tests are used as an index of their teaching efficiency, and that teachers are forced into stressing materials which are found in tests used to measure the results of their instruction.

The use of unstandardized tests in experiments of many types, including methods of instruction, size of classes, and grade placement of content, is likely to yield results in findings of doubtful worth, according to some critics. It is argued that when one unstandardized test, or a series of such tests, are used for purposes of obtaining objective evidence on the results of instruction, the findings and the generalizations made on the basis of the findings are no more valid than the tests used, and then only with the qualifying statement "in terms of what the test or tests measure." Such results, however, are often apparently set forth

[10]Bernard Iddings Bell, "Informing the Uninformed," *Saturday Review of Literature*, VII (September 20, 1930), 138-39; G. Wakeman, "High Schools and Colleges," *School and Society*, XXXII (November 29, 1930), 731-32.

as conclusive evidence, although the readers of the reports published in the periodicals do not always have an opportunity to evaluate the tests because of lack of space for their publication in the reports of experiments. In many instances, other types of data are not included in the reports, because they apparently do not fall within the category known as objective evidence, while results in the form of test scores are given because presumably such results are said to be objective. Readers, however, are left in doubt as to what the tests actually measure. If they measure informational values, and the experiments reported deal with class size, then the findings are significant only as to information retained by pupils, not what ability they have developed in the handling of facts. Thus runs the argument advanced by critics on some of the experimentation in which scores on unstandardized tests are used, in many instances, as the only source of reported evidence.

A more fundamental problem raised by some critics is the assertion that there is a danger that the testing movement in the social studies is likely to harness the teaching of the social studies with the concept of a static social order.[11] It is maintained that teachers depend to a great extent upon textbooks for materials for instruction and for items for tests, that tests, many of which are limited to the reproduction of information, tend to encourage the dependence of pupils on textbooks, that students leave the secondary school with infantile ideas and attitudes with respect to the basic social, economic, and political problems, that students whose formal school training is largely confined to the limits of textbooks tend to demand and to read books as adults which provide easy reading and ready remedies for all social ills, forgetting that they get only what they work for in things intellectual. This criticism is really a part of one mentioned earlier, although it is broader in its implications and comes from persons who are not teachers in the public schools. The issue involved seems to be whether pupils are stimulated and given opportunities to gain a command of facts, whether they are taught to think, and whether

[11]Harold M. Vinacke, "Smugness in Civics Teaching," *Educational Review*, LXIX (January, 1925), 8-13; Joseph K. Hart, *A Social Intrepretation of Education*, esp., 384-87, 399-400.

the testing program in vogue in the schools tends to encourage or to defeat this end.

There is by no means unanimous agreement among teachers of the social studies as to the relationships between the testing movement and the essay type of examination. The advantages and disadvantages of both the new type of test and the essay of examination have been set forth by different authors.[12] There are many critics of the essay examination, and it has been displaced in many schools by the new type of test. While it is doubtless true that the latter possesses certain advantages over the former, in the present state of experimentation it may be possible that both may be used to advantage in such a way as to present complementary evidence concerning the performance and attainments of pupils in the social studies. Ideally the essay type of examination is said to enable pupils to show their command of a range of pertinent information, to present facts in a sequential order, to organize materials which bear on the problems at hand. In short, it is maintained that the essay type of examination may be used by pupils to demonstrate their ability to think in ever widening ranges, and their discrimination in the selection and organization of materials. Pupils are placed in a position to demonstrate their own resources, instead of being limited to a series or a specified number of responses.[13] Whether these same ends may be gained through the use of new type tests is regarded by many capable teachers as a debatable proposition in the light of present evidence. The merits and demerits of both types should receive further evaluation in terms of verifiable results, rather than in terms of pious hopes and bold assertions. Meanwhile there seems to be a disposition on the part of capable and experienced teachers in many schools to continue to use both types as complementary measures of pupil attainments.

---

[12]For a detailed presentation of the advantages and disadvantages of examinations, see Walter S. Monroe, *Written Examinations and Their Improvement* (Bulletin No. 9, Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois—University of Illinois Bulletin, XX, No. 7, October 16, 1922.) Also published in *Historical Outlook*, XIV (June, November, 1923), 211-18, 306-18.

[13]See A. C. Krey, *op. cit.*, 161-62, for a discussion of the problems at the college level. See also Frederick Happold, "A New Type of Question in Examination Papers," *History* (London), XIII (July, 1928), 126-30.

Some of the larger problems and their implications for experimentation in testing in the social studies, as set forth above, merit the earnest and sustained consideration by all persons interested in the teaching of the social studies. Some of the critics may see only certain aspects of the total situation, some of the criticisms may be unfounded and biased, but teachers of the social studies and school people in general cannot rationalize and ignore the criticisms without loss of confidence and without considering the possibility of doing an injustice to the thousands of boys and girls who look to them for instruction, guidance and enlightenment. Much more experimentation is needed to ascertain the part which the testing program can rightfully play in the total process of instruction in the social studies, in the determination of the worth of the claims made for the tests now available, and in the careful evaluation of new tests which may be devised from time to time. The problems involved are among the most basic and crucial elements in the further development of the program for the social studies in the schools, and they constitute a challenge to the clear thinking and co-operative efforts of all serious-minded teachers, supervisors, and research workers.

W. G. Kimmel

EXERCISES IN THE USE OF HISTORICAL EVIDENCE

The making of any test which is to be standardized is at best a long and tedious process. Various methods of procedure have been used by those groups of educators who have made the standardized tests which are now so frequently used.

The particular purpose of the test which I have been asked to develop under the direction of Dr. Truman L. Kelly, with Professor Henry Johnson and Professor C. A. Krey as my historical advisers, is to test the ability to use historical evidence. The scope is very wide since it may include any historical material from the beginning of time to the present. The range is also wide since it is designed to test the ability to use evidence from the third grade level to the graduate college level.

At first thought this breadth of scope and range seemed to provide unlimited possibilities for varied exercises. But a more deliberate consideration revealed a number of very definite limitations, most of which are inherent in the nature of testing.

First, all questions must necessarily lend themselves to a system of checks as answers in order to make possible the scoring of the papers on an objective basis by clerical assistants.

Secondly, the exercises must be arranged in such a way that opportunities for guessing will be reduced to a minimum and each response, as nearly as possible, will represent real thinking.

Thirdly, if possible, varying degrees of acceptability in answers should be avoided. This calls for an absolutism of response which is difficult to arrive at in the field of the social studies.

Fourthly, the vocabulary must be suited to successive grade levels.

With these and other limitations in mind, we set out upon the task of selecting historical material which lends itself to testing purposes. There was much trial and error in this procedure. Many hours were spent in the collection of material which had to be discarded because it proved to be the type of evidence which could be discussed, but which did not lead to conclusions, sufficiently definite to permit of a check as a response; or, because its

degree of probability might be questioned; or, because the evi dence required so lengthy a treatment that it could not be included; or, because of some other equally undesirable feature.

The making of exercises for the third grade, the lowest level we were attempting to test, offered exceptional difficulty on account of the limited reading ability of the children. Even the Thorndike Word List seemed to be inadequate as a guide, for the reason that it shows the *frequency* of words rather than their reading ease and that it does not include on a third grade level many words such as *Eskimo* and *colonial* which become familiar to children through social studies activities, while *airplanes*, of course, does not appear in it at all. Also, it is difficult to make exercises on this level which call for some simple type of historical thinking beyond the mere power to read and interpret. Exercises on the highest levels also proved difficult to set up, first, because it is impossible to say just when the adult level is reached; and secondly, because it is practically impossible to grade adult exercises on levels of increasing difficulty.

In the course of five or six months a sufficient number of exercises were worked out to call for about two thousand responses. Critical analysis and suggestions for reorganization of the material were next undertaken. Professor Henry Johnson, and others in the field of history, suggested the rejection or revision of some material improperly used as evidence; Dr. Truman Kelly criticised the exercises from the standpoint of their suitability as testing material; and a number of laymen who read the exercises critically offered helpful suggestions.

In the first form all of the exercises called for conclusions to be drawn from evidence.

It was Dr. Kelly's suggestion, I believe, that it would be desirable to set up the exercises so as to test the ability to use evidence in several of the various ways in which that ability is called for in everyday life. This led to a study of the uses of evidence. The conclusions drawn from the mass of notes taken as a result of observing hundreds of cases, the following brief statement shows:

(1) We use evidence for the purpose of drawing conclusions. This use is common to people in all walks of life. The lack of the ability, or the lack of the habit of using evidence in this way,

leads to misunderstanding between nations and individuals, to gossip, and to all other evils which may be generally grouped under the heading "jumping at conclusions". If the historical method which is more and more obtaining in the teaching of our social studies results in any great good to humanity, it certainly should show an increasing accuracy in the use of evidence in drawing conclusions.

(2) Another common use of evidence is the implication of one fact from another. For example: We read that a certain young man living in Chicago in 1820 writes in his diary frequently the killing of wolves. This may be called the given fact. A fact which may readily be implied from the given fact is that the neighborhood of Chicago was rather wild and unsettled at the time when this young man was writing. It was therefore decided that this use of evidence should be included in the test.

(3) In using any number of facts as evidence, it is usually necessary to group these facts under certain headings before proper conclusions can be reached. It was therefore decided that we should include in our test of the use of evidence the ability to group that evidence.

The ability to judge the relative value of evidence by the realization of the type of evidence is one of the most valuable assets of everyday living as it is of historical thinking. Therefore, it was decided to include in this test exercises which would require the student to judge whether the evidence given was a specific fact, a general fact, or the writer's personal opinion.

The reorganization of the test was then undertaken in an effort to meet the conditions decided upon in various conferences. Summarizing these conditions, we have:

1. Varying the form of the exercises to include four types of exercises.
2. Providing directions for doing each type of exercise.
3. Grading the exercises in each form according to difficulty.
4. Providing for historical thinking for each response.
5. Providing a mechanism which lends itself to standardization.

This task proved to be so difficult that the exercises have been recast seven times. It is surprising how carefully such a set-up can be made today and how inadequate the same set-up seems tomorrow.

During the summer of 1930 it was decided that the exercises were ready for experimentation. With the approval of the officers of commission and of my advisers, the tests were copyrighted by the commission and printed by Charles Scribner Sons. Two thousand copies are now in experimental use.

In the present form the exercises are divided into two distinct tests; the first for children on an elementary school level from the third to the sixth grade, the second an advanced test to be given to students in the junior high school, high school, college, and possibly to adults not included in any educational institution.

The exercises for the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades are set up in three books, and those for the upper schools and for adults, in four. In each case the first book, called Group I, contains the exercises for testing the ability to draw conclusions; the second book, called Group II, contains those for testing the ability to make proper implications from facts, and the third book, called Group III, contains the exercises in grouping facts under proper headings. In the fourth book of the advanced test the student is asked to classify each item of evidence as (1) a specific fact, (2) a general fact, (3) an opinion of a situation, and (4) an opinion of a motive.

The scope and general character of the tests can best be understood by a few examples. The two exercises which follow are taken from Group I, the test for drawing conclusions. The first is on a third or fourth grade level and the second on an adult level.

Exercise III

Colonial homes were heated by open fireplaces where great logs were burned. They were lighted by candles which were usually home-made. The cooking was done in great kettles hung over the fire, or in the great oven at the side of the fireplace. The clothes were usually homespun but there were a few tailors in the towns.

After you have read the story carefully, place a check in the proper square after each statement.

STATEMENTS:

	True	Does not tell	False
1. The colonial boy could help his mother by bringing up the coal.	☐	☐	☐
2. The colonial boy could help his mother by making candles.	☐	☐	☐
3. The colonial boy could help his mother by going to the store to buy his clothes.	☐	☐	☐

EXERCISE IX

During the Revolutionary War, Congress obtained money from three principal sources.

They asked the states to raise money by taxation and they attempted to lay some taxes themselves. This effort to fund the Revolution was not very satisfactory because the states were already under a financial strain to support their own state troops and because Congress had no power to collect taxes.

Congress was able to borrow some money from foreign countries and from private citizens of foreign countries.

But the greater part of their money had to be obtained by loans from states and from the individuals in America. The bonds and bills of credit which Congress issued as security for less loans depreciated in value as the helplessness of Congress under the Articles of Confederation became apparent. Many farmers, small merchants, and soldiers sold their securities for a very small fraction, sometimes as low as one half of their original value, either because they were in need, or because they had little faith in the ability of the people of the United States to form a stable government.

After the constitution was adopted, Alexander Hamilton was appointed Secretary of the Treasury. In August, 1789, some Pennsylvanians asked Congress to consider making appropriations to satisfy their creditors. Congress requested Hamilton to make a report on the Public Credit and to recommend ways of funding it.

Five months after the request from Pennsylvania, Hamilton made his first report. He had found, he said, the foreign debt to be $11,710,378.62 the liquidated domestic debt to be $40,414,085.94 and the unliquidated debt about $2,000,000. "These several sums" states his report, "constitute the whole of the debt of the United States, amounting together to $54,124,464 56. That of the individual states is not equally well ascertained. . . . The

secretary, however, presumes that the total amount may be safely stated at $25,000,000. . . .

As a matter of fact, it was nearly a hundred years later before the records of all the loan officers were finally collected.

Hamilton proposed that Congress fund the entire national debts, domestic and foreign, principal and interest at face value. This meant that every person or government who at the time of refunding held any old bonds or certificates, would receive new securities from the United States government. A part of these securities was to bear 6 per cent interest, another part 3 per cent, and the interest on the remainder was to be deferred for ten years.

Hamilton planned also that the United States should pay the debts of the various states, which differed from each other greatly in amount.

After you have read these facts carefully, place a check in the appropriate square after each statement.

	True	Not proved by evidence	False
A. According to Hamilton's plan,			
1. Members of Congress would benefit more than any other Americans by the payment of debts.	☐	☐	☐
2. Many of the people who loaned money to Congress during the war would be taxed to pay to the present owners the face value of securities on which they as the original owners had already lost heavily.	☐	☐	☐
3. All creditors of the United States would be benefited in exact proportion to their financial service to the country during the war.	☐	☐	☐
4. Some states would be forced to pay a larger part of the whole indebtedness than they would have paid had Congress not assumed the state debts.	☐	☐	☐
B. Regarding Hamilton's credit report,			
5. We may safely accept his statements of amounts as exact and final except in case of the state debts.	☐	☐	☐

	True	Not proved by evidence	False
6. Many of the records necessary to an accurate report must have been unavailable to Hamilton.	☐	☐	☐
7. Hamilton included in his report every type of debt that Congress owed.	☐	☐	☐
C. The carrying out of Hamilton's plan would,			
8. Cause European nations to look to the United States government rather than to the State governments as responsible for the financial stability of America.	☐	☐	☐
9. Cause the individual states to look upon themselves as a Confederacy rather than a Union.	☐	☐	☐
10. Make future indebtedness of states unnecessary.	☐	☐	☐

It should be noted that the element of guessing so much criticized in the true-false form of test has been reduced by the addition of a third possible response, "not proved by evidence."

The next example is taken from about the middle of the Group II exercises as graded in difficulty. This is the exercise requiring proper implication from facts.

Exercise VI

Given facts:

I. From 1821 to 1830 many people from the United States moved to Texas and were given land by Mexico.

II. The Texans, who were largely from the United States, fought for and won their independence from Mexico in 1836.

III. Texas asked to join the United States.

IV. Texas people said they must be allowed to keep their slaves.

Place a check in the appropriate square, or squares, after each of the following statements to show which given fact, or facts, show this statement to be true.

Statements:

	Fact I	Fact II	Fact III	Fact IV
1. The request of Texas for admission to the U. S. presented this problem: whether it would be wise to have additional members of Congress who favored the extension of slavery.	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Texas was an independent nation during a part of its history.	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Mexico endangered the integrity of its own territory in its eagerness to settle its open lands.	☐	☐	☐	☐

It is to be noted in this exercise that the element of guessing again is reduced by making the number of statements different from the number of facts.

The tests in Group III which call for grouping under proper headings may be illustrated by the following exercise on approximately a high school level.

Exercise III

Slavery in the South and *the extension of slavery into new territory added to the United States* are two quite distinct phases of the question of slavery.

Indicate by checks in the appropriate squares whether each of the following statements pertain to slavery or to the extension of slavery. If the evidence given in the sentence is not sufficient to indicate which subject it belongs with, place a check in the appropriate square to indicate that.

	Pertains to slavery	Pertains to the extension of slavery	Not indicated in the sentence
1. William Lloyd Garrison said: "I shall contend for the immediate enfranchisement (right to vote) of our slave population."	☐	☐	☐
2. In Virginia in 1831 a motion was made in the legislature to abolish slavery but no one could suggest what to do with the slaves if they were freed so the motion came to nothing.	☐	☐	☐

	Pertains to slavery	Pertains to the extension of slavery	Not indicated in the sentence
3. After the U. S. had won the Southwest from Mexico, a member of Congress by the name of Wilmot proposed a bill, that none of the land acquired from Mexico should be open to slavery.	☐	☐	☐
4. In 1848 a Free Soil party was organized.	☐	☐	☐
5. When Lincoln became president he clearly stated that he would not interfere with slavery in the states where it existed.	☐	☐	☐
6. Lincoln said he would try to exclude slavery from the new territories.	☐	☐	☐

Group IV, which is given in the advanced test only, is as follows:

Exercise II

The following statements concern President Johnson who succeeded President Lincoln.

	General fact	Specific fact	Writer's personal opinion of situation	Writer's personal opinion of motive
1. Early in life he had been a poor tailor.	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. His administration would have been more successful if he had possessed Lincoln's tact.	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Many of his recommendations proved to be very valuable to the nation.	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Johnson kept most of Lincoln's cabinet because he wished to follow Lincoln's policies.	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. When Johnson was impeached and tried by the Senate the vote for conviction was 35 ayes to 19 noes.	☐	☐	☐	☐

That very young children discriminate between fact and opinion is probable but we have not yet been able to create an exercise of this type simple enough in its vocabulary and content for the lower grades.

The purpose of using the test in this crude form is to do the coarse sifting of material, that is, to discover what is worthless and what is valuable in the test by having it actually used by two thousand pupils. A second purpose in giving it is to develop a technique for administering the test. In order that this technique may fit the needs of as many children as possible, the testers, during the first few days adapted their explanations to the needs of each class as the tests were given. A stenographer took careful notes of all that was said by the tester, questions which were asked by the children, and observations in regard to various types of difficulties which the children had with the questions, exercises which the children especially enjoyed and any other observations which might be of help in organizing the final directions for giving the test. From these notes directions for giving the tests have been drawn up and will be used during the remainder of the experimentation.

The courtesy of the many school administrators and teachers has made the experimental testing possible. The list can be given here only in part since all arrangements have not yet been completed.

Professor Henry Johnson of Teachers College, Columbia University, Mr. Frank Pickell and the principals and teachers of the Montclair Public Schools, Professor Ray Hatch and Miss Florence Stryker of the State Teachers College at Montclair, Miss Anna Gannett, principal, and the teachers of Brookside School in Montclair, Miss Clara Levy, Miss Eda Willard and Miss Rachel Jarrold, heads of the departments of History of the State Normal Schools of New Jersey at Newark, Glassboro, and Trenton, respectively, Miss North, head of the department of history in the Montclair High School; and Mr. William C. Davis, supervising principal at Haddon Heights, New Jersey.

To draw conclusions regarding the exercises at this time, would be premature and inconclusive. For that, we must ask you to wait for a later report which can be made only after a thorough study of the results of this tentative testing.

MARION G. CLARK

Note:—The examples of test exercises used here are copyrighted by the American Historical Association Investigation of the Social Studies and may be published as a part of this article only by their permission.

M. G. C.

Europe is pessimistic. That is not new. Ever since the armistice, pessimism has been uppermost in many European quarters. But happily, year by year serious difficulties that threatened the peace were solved or postponed. The German Republic has not succumbed either to Bolshevism or to Fascism. Indeed, the German people have shown extraordinary courage, endurance, and inventiveness in reconstructing and enlarging their industrial and commercial polity. French credit, gravely impaired for a time, has been rehabilitated and strengthened, until today Paris stands second to New York in its gold reserves. Austria and Hungary, at one time on the verge of disintegration—mere fragments of a once great empire—have refused to die. Flare-ups in the Balkans have not resulted in war—not even in small wars. The League of Nations has not been either the futile debating society pictured by the cynics, or the unholy means of sanctifying the territorial *status quo* feared by many liberals. In short, the pessimists of the past twelve years have again and again been confuted by the facts. And, so, if today I seem to share the pessimism abroad, I hope you will not conclude that I am without hope.

Anxiety is undeniably the predominant note in Europe today. Not in recent years have there been so many clear indications of this mood. This was manifested repeatedly during the eleventh session of the Assembly of the League of Nations. There, as one talked to members of delegations from many parts of the world, and listened to the addresses and discussions in the public meetings of the Assembly, the Council, the different committees, it was impossible to escape the feeling that once again Europe is uneasy about the future. There is no fear that war is imminent, but on all sides one hears expressions of grave concern.

The reasons for this widespread uneasiness are not difficult to discover. It has grown out of the world-wide economic depression and the inability of the capitalist States to work together to counteract the economic crisis; the failure, from the continental-

European point of view, of the London Naval Conference; the extraordinary success of the reactionary political forces in Germany; the failure of the League of Nations to secure any substantial measure of reduction of land forces and the consequent doubtfulness as to the League's ability to survive a prolonged and fundamental division among the European powers; finally, the continued fear of the potential power of Communist Russia—the shadow cast by Moscow over Europe grows longer and deeper. Out of the combined force of these factors has come the present disquietude as to whether the peace of Europe can be made secure for the next generation.

The decline in business, which began for us last fall, began earlier in Europe. The facts are obvious. For years Great Britain suffered from chronic unemployment and staggering taxation; Germany sweated under a heavy load of taxation, a large portion of which was expended on unemployment relief and other forms of social legislation; elsewhere in Europe since the war, except in France, unemployment was increasingly troubling statesmen. Then suddenly came the Wall Street crash; its repercussions are still felt throughout the whole of Europe.

The unsettlement of European business was further aggravated by tariff legislation here. Doubtless the effects of the Hawley-Smoot Bill have been exaggerated by some writers. But two unfortunate results are undeniably evident. Certain European industries which previously had been operating below their full capacities became almost panic stricken for fear that the tariff would close the American market. In this frightened state of mind some of the manufacturers closed their plants or drastically cut their working forces weeks before any direct effect of the tariff could possibly have been felt; for example, the watch industry in Switzerland suffered something like demoralization. A more important effect of the American tariff was the discouragement of the efforts made under the League of Nations auspices to secure a tariff truce between the European States. Two years ago in Geneva, League officials had high hopes that a beginning could at last be made toward the breakdown of those many and exasperating tariff barriers and import and export restrictions which since the war have been so largely responsible for retarding the normal recuperative processes of business.

Embarrassed by the continued economic depression at home, and anticipating the certainty of higher tariff duties in the United States, European statesmen drew back and said to the League in effect, "Under these circumstances we cannot give up any weapon which may later prove to be necessary to defend our home markets. We will not reduce our tariffs and we will not enter into binding agreements as to the future which might limit our freedom of action." As a result, nothing substantial was accomplished by the League's efforts.

It would, of course, be easy to condemn this stand as unstatesmanlike. But certainly the Hawley-Smoot Bill strengthened the hands of all of the high tariff advocates in Europe and weakened the position of those who had been wisely seeking closer economic cooperation among the twenty-seven European States.

But some of you are probably asking, "What of the United States of Europe? Did not M. Briand propose at the last Assembly of the League a closer economic integration of the European continent?" Unfortunately, he did not. In presenting his proposal for a United States of Europe, he reiterated his earlier interpretation that this move toward unity should first be made along the political and not the economic road. Because of that emphasis, his case was weakened. Germany, for example, saw in the proposal another means of maintaining the political *status quo* with but little hope of leading toward the European *zollverein* which German industrialists have long favored. Moreover, many loyal friends of the League saw in Briand's proposal a potential threat of a rival organization. Briand denied that a United States of Europe, as he envisaged it, could in any way weaken the League; rather would it reinforce the League. But despite his eloquence, the French Foreign Minister failed to convince the doubters. In the end, his proposal was referred to a sub-committee of the League, of which he is chairman and Sir Eric Drummond secretary. Thus, for good or ill, the idea of a United States of Europe is to be kept within the orbit of the League. For the present, however, this ideal cannot help to mitigate the continued economic depression in Europe.

Indeed, it is not so much the economic depression itself which causes far-sighted Europeans to be disheartened, as it is the inability of the capitalist European States to formulate any sort of

even the most elementary plan for common action in the present crisis. Of course, the International Bank at Basle is a clearing house for the ideas of the governors of the great national banks of issue, though our Government does not permit a representative of the Federal Reserve System to participate. In other ways, too, financial and industrial leaders from the different countries have been exchanging views. But the responsible governmental authorities have not attempted to find a basis for a united front against the common enemy, unemployment, the result of fundamental dislocations in the capitalist system. The European peoples are like seasick passengers on a crazy boat whose course is uncharted and whose officers cannot agree. It is bad enough to be seasick; but it is much worse to doubt whether the officers of your ship know where they are going or how to get there. Europe today seems to me to be sailing much that kind of a voyage.

Some of you may have been surprised when I suggested at the beginning that the results of the London Naval Conference have contributed to Europe's present anxieties. In the United States we think merely of the successes of that conference and forget that these pertained only to Great Britain, Japan, and the United States. France and Italy came out of the conference further apart than when the negotiations began. But Franco-Italian differences go deeper than the question of naval parity between the two countries. One cannot listen to Italian and French spokesmen without being impressed by the diversity of factors that contribute to the present misunderstanding between the two peoples who should have so much in common. And yet I am sometimes tempted to think that more important than questions about the rights of Italians in Tunis and territorial disputes elsewhere in Africa or the comparative size of fleets is the psychological element. If only the French would take the Italians seriously. The Italians are a proud people. Late in achieving national unity, they were disadvantaged in the scramble for colonial possessions. They feel even more keenly under Fascism than under the old régime what they call France's "airs of superiority." If this resentment could be appeased, the specific points at issue between the two countries could be settled much more readily. So long as they remain unsolved, they will continue to trouble European politics and contribute to the prevailing uneasiness.

A factor that more recently contributed to the general pessimism was the results of the German elections last September. I was in Geneva at the time these were announced. I had just come from Berlin and Hamburg, where a few days earlier I had talked with many Germans about the prospects of the elections. All of these men and women anticipated a substantial gain by the parties of the extreme left and right, but no one ventured to prophesy that the Hitlerite would increase their vote from less than a million to over six million. I shall not soon forget the disappointment and apprehension in Geneva that greeted the news from Germany. The delegates to the Assembly of the League of Nations, gathered in the lobbies and the corridors, talked about little else, each interpreting the surprising gains of the Communists and the Fascists as a challenge to the Republic in Germany and a threat to the policy of fulfillment of its international obligations—a policy inaugurated by the late Dr. Stresemann, under whose leadership Germany became in recent years a powerful conciliatory force throughout Europe.

Happily, those first gloomy forebodings have not been borne out by subsequent developments. There is no indication that the parliamentary system has been seriously threatened or that Germany's foreign policy is to be modified sharply in the near future. On the contrary, Chancellor Bruening, despite his precarious position in the Reichstag, seems now to have a fair chance of making effective his drastic internal financial reforms. He, of course, has had the consistent and firm support of President von Hindenburg. If this were all, it would have been tantamount to the establishment of a virtual dictatorship. It is not all, however, because the Socialists, through an attitude of benevolent neutrality, have enabled the government to maintain a majority in the Reichstag. Still, one cannot be sure that Germany from a domestic point of view is out of danger. The vote cast by the National Socialists in the recent municipal election in Bremen would seem to indicate that the Fascists had gained rather than lost ground since the last general elections three months earlier. But the graver the peril of Fascist domination, the more likely the consolidation of forces of the moderate parties in support of the Republic. However, until such a united front against the extremists

is evident, Europe will watch with anxiety the developments within Germany.

To my mind, more discouraging than the internal situation in Germany is the failure of Europe as a whole to move toward disarmament. Twelve years after the armistice the nations are still seeking to find means to lighten the crushing burdens of military preparedness, for no substantial progress has yet been made. The world is spending this year between four and five billion dollars in preparation for the next war. This of course does not include the vastly larger sums that are being expended in pensions and otherwise to pay for past wars. Europe has more men under arms today than before the war—despite the fact that Germany's army has been reduced to 100,000 and those of the other ex-enemy States have been reduced proportionally. This is all the more startling considered in the light of the declaration by the representatives of the Allies and the United States that Germany's disarmament under the terms of the Versailles Treaty was to be a first step toward general disarmament.

Europe thus continues, as before the war, to be an armed camp—but with this difference; there is lacking in Europe today the equilibrium of military forces that existed before the war. In the resentment engendered by this inequality lie the perils that confront us. The countries defeated in the war and disarmed by the Peace Treaties are determined to redress that inequality between their forces and those of the victors.

Thus far the ex-enemy States have been content to work toward this end through the League of Nations. The Covenant imposed upon the Council of the League the duty to formulate plans for the reduction of armaments "to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations." The League has tried valiantly to carry out this mandate. Its efforts have been along two general lines: one, the strengthening of the world's machinery for peace, so as to build up the moral forces of security; and, two, the calling of conferences to study methods of limiting or reducing existing military forces.

The League's direct efforts at disarmament have not thus far been fruitful. During the past five years its efforts have centered in the so-called Preparatory Commission for the General Dis-

armament Conference. The task of the Preparatory Commission is the technical one of determining how the nations can proceed to disarm; the political one of determining how much the nations shall disarm is left to the Disarmament Conference. On the Preparatory Commission are represented thirty-five countries, including all of the great powers in the League, and the United States, Russia, and Turkey, which are not members of the League. It is just now concluding its sixth session, and has succeeded in drawing up a draft treaty. That is some gain. But many of the more difficult questions have been postponed, and all of these, together with the crucial question of what figures are to be written into the draft treaty, are left for consideration by the Disarmament Conference itself. The Preparatory Commission was not able to agree upon a date for the Disarmament Conference, but the general view is that it will be called in 1932.

If that conference should again be postponed or should fail in its objective, there is apprehension that the German Government would be forced by public opinion to ignore the limitations of the Treaty of Versailles and build up its armaments. In that event, Europe would be faced with the gravest situation since the war.

But what of the League itself? There is no time today to outline the gradual enlargement of the League's functions and its efforts to build bulwarks against war. Suffice it to say that the League, by its day to day and year to year activities, has so gained the confidence of most of the nations, that it is now accepted as an indispensable instrument of international cooperation. But it has not been able to produce that degree of security which the French Government and the governments of its allies continue to demand as a condition precedent to disarmament. And that is one of the most important reasons why the League has not yet been able to build its foundation deep enough to withstand a major European crisis.

That danger to the League is from without. It was evident in the last Assembly that the League is troubled also from within. The Secretariat is suffering from a degree of disillusionment natural at the end of its first decade. The first flush of idealism and fervor has in some departments given way to routine bureaucracy. Happily, this danger has been sensed and can be checked. There is, however, another internal danger. The League is

threatened by the efforts of certain governments to modify control of the Secretariat so as to make the League's civil service more dependent upon the Foreign Offices of the great powers and, therefore, less truly international. Recently the lead in this direction was taken by Germany and Italy. Fortunately the project of limiting the independence of the Secretary General by setting up a sort of governing soviet directly dependent upon the great powers was defeated. It is to be expected that, as the League grows in importance, there will be increased efforts by national interests to control the Secretariat. But I believe that the smaller countries, led by Holland and the Scandinavian States, will be able to checkmate the efforts to make of the League primarily a concert of powers.

Though Europeans are worried about all of the factors I have discussed—the economic depression, the strained relations between France and Italy, the political reaction in Germany, the difficulties of land disarmament, and the League's failure to solve this problem—there is one other vital element in the situation. Almost without exception every conversation I had last summer, whether with European statesmen or industralists, included references to Russia. At no time since the Bolshevik revolution more than thirteen years ago have Europeans been so much interested in and so much worried by the Communist experiment. Now it is not so much Communist propaganda that is feared. It is the possibility of the success of the gigantic Communist industrial and agrarian program that is causing statesmen sleepless nights. The Five-Year Plan occupies the headlines of the European dailies almost as it does the front pages of our newspapers. Russian "dumping" is the menace which the casual observer fears. But wiser leaders see further than that. What they fear most is the united front which Communist Russia presents to a divided, almost anarchical, capitalist Europe. As one financier put it to me, "The Communists have unity in their planning, unity in the execution of their plan, and are zealots in their fanatical devotion to their cause. We capitalist Europeans have not unity in our plans or in the execution of our programs. We checkmate each other by senseless competition, by fantastic tariffs, by prodigal expenditures on preparations to destroy each other." There is the crux of the matter. The Russian menace to Europe lies

less in the strength of Communism then in the weakness of capitalism.

However, it would be surprising if in this audience some one were not saying to himself, "What has all of this to do with us? Even if the worst comes to the worst in Europe, we can remain aloof."

Can we? Compare for a moment the position of the United States in the world today with that in 1917. Then we were still a debtor nation; today we are a creditor to the rest of the world by more than twenty billions of dollars. In every State of the Union and in nearly every city and town banks and other organizations or individuals own foreign securities. Then we were relatively independent of the markets of the rest of the world; today the prosperity of our farmers just as much as that of our manufacturers depends upon their ability to export their surplus. On this point I refer you to the brilliant address by Mr. Owen D. Young in San Francisco last June. The threads of America's commercial interests are inextricably woven into the fabric of the world's economic life. That fabric cannot break anywhere without injury to us.

However, my questioner might continue, "In any case, surely the United States cannot be blamed for the difficulties and dangers that beset Europe. Has not our country always done more than its full share in the building of defenses against war? For example, has not the United States been the leader in promoting the cause of international arbitration?" Yes and no. When we were a weak country we were leaders in arbitration. But more recently, as we have grown stronger, the Senate has consistently refused to ratify any general arbitration treaty unless it reserved to the Senate the right to decide by a two-thirds vote in each particular controversy whether that controversy should be referred to judicial settlement. In other words, the Senate is willing to agree to arbitrate only on condition that, when an issue arises, the Senate may then decide whether that issue shall or shall not be arbitrated.

And as to the Permanent Court of International Justice, we have now delayed ten years in giving it our adherence. The World Court was predominantly American in its genesis; our most distinguished living statesman was the leader in drawing up the

Court Statute and in working out the compromise formula to satisfy the reservations insisted upon by our Senate; after functioning for eight years, the Court has proved incontestably its usefulness and its independence. Yet today our nationalists are raising a hue and cry against President Hoover because of his determination to submit the Court Protocol to the Senate for action. An aroused public opinion must assert itself if adherence to the Court is not again to be defeated or postponed.

But have we not led in the limitation of armaments, notably on the sea? Yes. The Washington and London conferences did accomplish more than has been achieved in any other way. But the London conference leaves us with the right to build a navy equal to that of Great Britain. This, according to our naval experts, will require the expenditure by the United States of approximately a billion dollars. And, as the French have been quick to point out, the treaty has reduced naval armaments very little if at all and has left the United States and Great Britain supreme on the sea.

But did not the United States push through the Kellogg pact with its pledge against resort to war as an instrument of national policy? Yes. But since then our Government has consistently refused to commit itself to any form of consultation in the event that the pact is violated. Nor has Washington been willing to enunciate the principle that the United States would not insist upon its neutral rights to trade with an aggressor State that had broken its pledge under the pact. Through our unwillingness to implement the pact in either of these ways, we have undoubtedly weakened it.

Even more directly, our contention that interallied debts and reparations are separate and distinct has prevented a more reasonable adjustment of the reparations problem. And the failure of the Allies to reach a solution of that problem which the debtor as well as the creditor countries can agree to be final retards sadly the normal recovery and expansion of world trade. It is not an accident that the two countries, France and the United States, which receive directly and indirectly the great bulk of the German payments, should have accumulated gold reserves so huge as to embarrass them and threaten the well-being of much of the world.

Nor can even the most uncompromising advocate of higher and higher tariffs argue that the Hawley-Smoot Bill is a contribution to international amity.

Similarly, the aloofness of the United States from the League of Nations has weakened the world's most promising effort to save itself from new wars.

Perhaps some of you feel like saying, "Well, what about it? You have been merely critical. What have you that is constructive to suggest?" My answer is implicit in the criticisms I have made. Now that we are a great power, we must be willing to agree to arbitrate as unreservedly as we did when we were a fringe of weak States along the Atlantic seaboard. We must be willing to help make the Kellogg pact effective. We must recognize that interallied debts and reparations are but two closely interrelated parts of the same problem. We must begin to see that the ruthless exercise of an unlimited national prerogative to increase tariffs is inconsistent with our interests as a world creditor and is disruptive of the world capitalist economy. We must see that to remain outside of the League even though cooperating with it is to hamper its development.

If we are to be worthy of the unequalled wealth and strength that is ours, we must throw our full weight into the efforts now being made through the League of Nations and otherwise to build up a true world community.

James G. McDonald

REPORT OF REFERENDUM

Last Autumn, at Atlantic City, during the course of a discussion as to means of arousing a more intense interest on the part of our members in Association affairs, it was suggested that a questionnaire be submitted to all members. The questionnaire was to be so constructed that responses could be made with as great facility as possible, and the questions included were to be of universal interest to members of the history-teaching profession. The idea met with such favor that it was suggested that the sending of questionnaires be made an annual feature of Association policy. It was decided that the first question to be submitted to Association members should give them an opportunity to indicate what type of topics concerned them most nearly. The framing of the questionnaire was made the work of a committee headed by Professor Kelsey of Haverford, who was also entrusted with the tabulation and interpretation of the results, A copy of the questionnaire follows:

A Referendum for Members

Kindly indicate by numbering the following titles 1, 2, and 3 your feeling as to the relative emphasis that should be given to the three subjects at our meetings. Write the figure 1 before the title which you think should be given the largest place, and so on for 2 and 3.

Also, if convenient, write a statement not more than one hundred words long, defending your vote.

The results of the referendum and several of the best statements will be printed in the next issue of our PROCEEDINGS.

Ballot

Purely historical address or papers.
Methods of teaching.
Current problems, (national or international).

Name.....
Address.....

An encouraging response was received, two hundred and thirty members voting. Not all of these enclosed discussions. Below is given a tabulation of the results:

	Secondary Schools	*Colleges*	*Teacher Training*	*Others*	*Total*
Methods papers					
First choice	47	11	10	18	86
Second choice	42	10	2	4	58
Third choice	41	20	8	2	71
Current problems					
First choice	57	18	6	9	90
Second choice	47	15	10	14	86
Third choice	17	9	4	3	33
Historical papers					
First choice	26	19	7	2	54
Second choice	46	14	5	4	69
Third choice	64	9	6	15	94
Total votes					641

Before proceeding to the interpretations placed upon the results by Professor Kelsey and his committee, there are one or two points which perhaps are worthy of being kept in mind in the consideration of the above figures and of the interpretation itself. The most important is that the prevailing views in the different institutions represented cannot be accurately diagnosed from a cursory perusal of the figures. The fact that forty-seven secondary-school people are interested primarily in method, whereas only eleven college men hold a like opinion, does not show that methods are more popular among secondary-school than college representatives, for only forty-eight responses were received from college professors, and one hundred thirty, or more than half the total response, from secondary school teachers. About 36% of the secondary-school people, then, favored methods as the predominating topic for consideration, while 23% of those holding college positions shared this feeling. The margin of difference is far less than it would seem to be if the total response in each department were not considered.

The apparent discrepancy in the total number voting and the total second and third choices received is accounted for by the fact that many members indicated only a first choice, and others only a first and second choice. Several replies were received after the tabulation had been prepared, and were not included.

Professor Kelsey's report follows:

Report on Questionnaire

The replies to the recent questionnaire sent to our members were interesting and instructive. The questions as submitted and a tabular classification of replies are given below.

Some of the outstanding features of the results are as follows:

(1) Both college and high school people share a preference for current-event topics.

(2) High school people seem to disagree widely concerning the value of papers on method, being almost evenly divided among the three places.

(3) Purely historical papers seem to find scant favor except among college people. In the college group more people voted for purely historical than for any other type of paper. The high school vote for this type of paper, while it possessed greater volume than that of the colleges, was proportionally smaller.

(4) Teacher training institutions voted most strongly for method, 10 giving it first place.

The general conclusion to be drawn from the answers seems to be that the programs of our meetings should include papers on all three topics. Moreover, as several members pointed out in their replies, the quality of the address is more important than the topic. A live messenger with a real message seems always to be welcome on our programs.

We believe this questionnaire was worth while. It gave our members at large an opportunity to make their voices heard in our councils; it gave to the officers of the Association an indication of what the members are thinking; it demonstrated the fact that a goodly number of teachers in the Social Science field take their profession seriously.

In response to the appeal included in the referendum a number of our members sent in brief statements defending their votes.

These papers are exceedingly pertinent and interesting. It is to be regretted that there is not sufficient space to make it possible for the readers of this annual to get the benefit of every contribution sent to us. It was quite difficult to exclude any of these thoughtful expressions of opinion, but after considerable weighing of the papers submitted the following four have been chosen as representatives of the different points of view expressed by our contributors.

Statements of Opinion

I

If one were to take a vote among folk who love a garden, whether they preferred—

> Flowers themselves, long known and cherished but never fully understood or appreciated;
> New varieties, which perhaps in time will prove important and permanent additions; or,
> Newly-invented tools which have been known to be helpful in gardening—

there can be little doubt as to the answers given. One prefers to hear addresses or papers on subject-matter, because one knows the endlessness and the eternal newness of it; or as next best, discussions of the current problems which give some evidence of landing some day in the realm of significant history; and last of all because it is usually least valuable of all, discussions of method. I think, however, that this should be taken with much salt, for once in a blue moon someone does make a discovery or an invention in method, which is worth going a long way to see. I think that what an audience wants is vividness, insight, and conviction; and if this is offered in any department or phase of the work it makes an irresistible appeal.

Frances Morehouse
Hunter College, N. Y. C.

II

An interest in the subject-matter, I take it, is fundamental and universal among our members. The teacher in service needs the stimulus which comes from hearing purely historical papers as an incentive to keep alive a research interest, which, to say the least,

is too often inert, if not dead. Second in importance is the problem of teaching history, an interest especially strong among our members in secondary teaching, not as universal an interest as the first, but one which our Association is obligated by its very nature to develop. Discussion of current problems by outstanding authorities seems quite proper for our sessions of a more general, public, or social character.

ELMER LOUIS KAYSER
George Washington University
Washington, D. C.

March 18, 1930.

III

Those who attend the meetings are already teachers of history and therefore probably experimenting in the improvement of teaching. What they need most is (1) a historical reach to the great practical questions of our time; (2) the exhilaration that comes from sharing in some piece of actual historical investigation, even if the share taken is only an intelligent comprehension of the paper. We are all teachers already; we want to be historians also.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pa.

IV

The post-war period has called attention to the serious study of present-day problems. Historians with their perspectives ought to take an actual part in the solution of these problems by a factual study and discussion. I am thinking of M. E. Townsend's admirable article on "German vs. Polish Nationalism" (PROCEEDINGS, 1929).

Isaiah Bowman's article in the same number ought to get some of us seriously thinking about a philosophy of history.

Papers on "Methods of Teaching History" do not interest me particularly. They should interest high school teachers, however.

HUGO, C. WENDEL
Long Island University
Brooklyn, N. Y.

TREASURER'S REPORT FOR 1929-30

May 10, 1930

Receipts

Cash balance April 11, 1929	$	716.77
Dues collected during fiscal year 1929-30		697.00
Advertisements in PROCEEDINGS		450.00
Interest		23.97
Sale of PROCEEDINGS		118.41
Voluntary contributions		338.50
Total Receipts	$	2,344.65

Expenditures

Expenses connected with meetings	$	62.84
Expenses of Secretary in attending meetings		31.00
Postage and stationery		135.51
Multigraphing		59.05
Clerical assistance and postage		205.47
Publishing of Proceedings		552.66
Publishing of Membership List		14.34
Office Equipment		3.40
In error*		20.53
Balance on hand		1259.85
	$	2,344.65

*Confusion by bank of personal and association accounts

Audited and found correct:

Edward P. Smith

Frederick C. Hodgdon

Auditing Committee May 9, 1930

Lena C. Van Bibber,

Treasurer.

REPORT OF MEMBERSHIP

November, 1930

Members enrolled in 1930		
Paid-up membership		
Paid before May meeting	465	
Recorded since May meeting	89	
New members since May meeting	34	
Total paid-up membership		588
Non-paying members		1
Members in arrears		
For one year	44	
For two years	32	76
Total enrollment		665
Names dropped from roll since May meeting		
Resigned	9	
Not located	2	
Dropped from roll in accordance with constitutional provision	1	
Total dropped from roll		12

LENA C. VAN BIBBER,
Secretary.

CONSTITUTION

Article I. *Name and Purpose*

This Association shall be known as the "Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland". Its purpose shall be two-fold: First, to advance the studying and teaching of history and Other Social Sciences through discussion and publication and, secondly, to promote personal acquaintance among teachers and students in these fields.

Article II. *Membership*

Any one interested in the study or teaching of history and Other Social Sciences in the Middle States and Maryland shall be eligible to membership. Application for membership shall be accepted or rejected by a vote of the Council at its meeting next following the receipt of such application.

Article III. *Officers*

Section 1: There shall be a President, Vice-President and a Secretary-Treasurer, elected by ballot at the annual spring meeting. Their duties shall be those usually attached to their respective offices. The Secretary-Treasurer shall carefully preserve records of all meetings of the Council and of all business sessions of the Association; and these and other important records and correspondence shall be kept on file in the office of the Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2: The general direction of the affairs of the Association shall be vested in a Council, consisting of the three officers, the former presidents of the Association, two members elected annually and one delegate each appointed annually by such local associations as the Council may from time to time designate for this purpose.

Article IV. *Meetings*

The annual meeting of the Association shall be held at the time and place designated by the Council.

Article V. *Fiscal Year and Dues*

The fiscal year shall begin with the annual business meeting. The membership fee shall be one dollar, payable annually in April for the ensuing year. Members who have not paid their dues for the current year shall not be entitled to receive the publications of the Association while in arrears, and members who are two years in arrears and have received three notices of their indebtedness shall be regarded as having forfeited their membership.

Article VI. *Amendments*

This Constitution may be amended at any regular meeting by a two-thirds vote of those present, notice of the proposed amendment having been given in advance of the meeting.

SUBSCRIBING LIBRARIES

University of California Library, Berkeley, California.
Pomona College Library, Claremont, California.
Los Angeles Public Library, Los Angeles, California.
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California.

The College Library, Colorado State Teachers College, Greeley, Colorado.

Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

General Library, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

The Chicago Public Library, Chicago, Illinois.
The John Crerar Library, Chicago, Illinois.
General Library, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.
University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Illinois.

DePauw University Library, Greencastle, Indiana.
Logansport Public Library, Logansport, Indiana.

Iowa State College Library, Ames, Iowa.
Columbia College Library, Dubuque, Iowa.
State University of Iowa Library, Iowa City, Iowa.
Cornell College Library, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

Kellogg Library, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, Kansas.
State Agricultural College Library, Manhattan, Kansas.

Johns Hopkins University Library, Baltimore, Maryland.
Maryland State Normal School, Frostburg, Maryland.
Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Maryland.

Converse Memorial Library, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.
Graduate School of Education Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Harvard College Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
Smith College Library, Northampton, Massachusetts.
Wellesley College Library, Wellesley 81, Massachusetts.

General Library, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.
The Public Library, Detroit, Michigan.

University of Minnesota Library, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

University of Missouri Library, Columbia, Missouri.
St. Louis Public Library, St. Louis, Missouri.

State University Library, Missoula, Montana.

Nebraska University Library, Lincoln, Nebraska.

The Public Library, Newark, New Jersey.
Rutgers College Library, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
State Teachers College Library, Upper Montclair, New Jersey.

New York State Library, New York University, Albany, New York.
Alfred University Library, Alfred, New York.
Wells College Library, Aurora, New York.
Brooklyn Public Library, Brooklyn, New York.
Buffalo Public Library, Buffalo, New York.
The Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, New York.
Hobart College Library, Geneva, New York.
Colgate University Library, Hamilton, New York.
Teachers College Library, Columbia University, New York City.
New York Public Library, New York City.
Vassar College Library, Poughkeepsie, New York.

North Carolina College for Women Library, Greensboro, North Carolina.

Carnegie Library, Ohio University, Athens, Ohio.
Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland, Ohio.
College for Women Library, Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio.

University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.
Oregon State Library, Salem, Oregon.

Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pennsylvania.
University of Pennsylvania Library, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

University of Texas Library, Austin, Texas.

Lawrence College Library, Appleton, Wisconsin.
University of Wisconsin Library, Madison, Wisconsin.

THE COUNCIL

Officers

President

CHARLES A. BEARD

New Milford, Connecticut

Vice-President

MILDRED M. COUGHLIN

Western High School, Baltimore, Md.

Secretary-Treasurer

LENA C. VAN BIBBER

Maryland State Normal School at Towson

Additional Members of the Council

Former Presidents

Charles M. Andrews, Yale University.
James Harvey Robinson, New York City.
Cheesman A. Herrick, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Eleanor L. Lord, Rosemont, Pa.
Herman V. Ames, University of Pennsylvania.
James Sullivan, Assistant Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education, Albany, N. Y.
Edgar Dawson, Hunter College.
Albert E. McKinley, Editor, Historical Outlook.
Henry Johnson, Teachers College, Columbia University.
John Martin Vincent, Johns Hopkins University.
Jessie C. Evans, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Marshall S. Brown, New York University.
Livingston R. Schuyler, College of the City of New York.
Daniel C. Knowlton, New York University.
Albert K. Heckel, University of Missouri.
Raynor W. Kelsey, Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
J. Montgomery Gambrill, Teachers College, Columbia University.
Fayette E. Moyer, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.
John Holladay Latané, Johns Hopkins University.
James Lynn Barnard, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa.
William E. Lingelbach, University of Pennsylvania.
Harry J. Carman, Columbia University.
Kathryn E. C. Carrigan, Atlantic City High School.
Carlton J. H. Hayes, Columbia University.

Elective Members

Frances Morehouse, Hunter College.
D. Montford Melchoir, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Valentine L. Chandor, Miss Chandor's School for Girls, New York City.
Roy F. Nichols, University of Pennsylvania.

Delegates from Conferences

James A. Barkley, History Club of Delaware.
A. Golder, History Teachers Association of Maryland.
John T. Greenan, New Jersey Association of Teachers of Social Studies.
Clarence W. Miner, New York Council for Social Studies.
Rachel Selecter, History Club of Philadelphia.
Edmond S. Noyes, The Round Table of Teachers of the Social Sciences.
Washington, D. C.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Note: — The arrangement in this list is: (1) name, (2) official address, (3) residence. The city or postoffice address is given only once if it is the same for both (2) and (3).

Adams, Charles E., Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 5315 Bosworth Ave.
Adams, Gladys Marion, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 835 Drexel Ave., Drexel Hill, Pa.
Adele, Sister Mary, Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa.
Adriance, Robert I., High School, East Orange, N. J., 178 N. Walnut St.
Aitcheson, Mary C., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 311 South Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Albert, Grace, The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., The College Inn.
Allen, Freeman H., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 44 Broad St.
Allen, Joseph Dana, Headmaster, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 200 Hicks St.
Allen, Margaret E., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 610 S. 48 St.
Ambrosie, M. L., Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 14 Sherman Ave., Takoma Park.
Ames, Herman V., Dean, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Ammarell, Raymond R., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 41 Llewellyn Ave., Hawthorne, N. J.
Amos, Mrs. Esther Bosley, 3201 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.
Andrew, L. Elizabeth, 3305 Windsor Mill Road, Baltimore, Md.
Andrews, Ada Mary, 3305 Windsor Mill Road, Baltimore, Md.
Andrews, Charles M., Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Andrews, Elizabeth Agnes, Miss Wright's School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 307 Berkeley Road, Merion, Pa.

Andrews, Grace, James Madison High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 65 Jefferson Ave.

Applegate, Mrs. Stella S., Executive Clerk, New Jersey State Teachers Association, Room 304 Stacy-Trent Hotel, Trenton, N. J., 130 W. State St.

Arnold, Herbert F., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 221 E. Oakdale Ave., Glenside, Pa.

Arthur, L. Louise, Bryant High School, Long Island City, N. Y., 4144-48 St.

Bacon, Edna Lorine, East Side High School, Newark, N. J., 87 Fourth Ave.

Bader, Harriet, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Bagley, William C., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 410 Riverside Drive.

Baldwin, Frances Elizabeth, 147 W. Lanvale St., Baltimore, Md.

Baldwin, James Fosdick, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 160 College Ave.

Bamberger, Florence Eilau, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 2204 Park Ave.

Bamberger, Stella H., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 2204 Park Ave.

Banvard, Adele F., High School, East Orange, N. J., 73 N. Arlington Ave.

Barbour, Violet, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 158 College Ave.

Barker, Corinne M., New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, Glenwood Lodge, 390 N. Broadway, Yonkers, N. Y.

Barker, John B., Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 4127 Park Heights Ave.

Barkley, James A., University of Delaware, Newark, Del., 319 Springhill Ave., Wilmington, Del.

Barnard, James Lynn, Ursinus College, Collegeville, Pa., 39 Sixth Ave.

Barnes, Harry Elmer, Care of Scripps-Howard Newspapers, 230 Park Ave., New York City.

Barrick, Willina, Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 31 Gifford Ave.

Barth, Laura Florence, Supervising Principal, Keyser-Meehan School, Philadelphia, Pa., 2020 Frankford Ave.

Bartlett, L. J., Senior High School, Trenton, N. J., 110 Reading Ave.

Barton, Edwin Michelet, Director of Social Studies, Public Schools, Elizabeth, N. J., 79 Summit Road.

Bassett, Janet, Western High School, Baltimore, Maryland. 3218 Fait Ave.

Bausman, Naomi, Westfield Friends' School, Riverton, N. J.

Beard, Charles A., New Milford, Conn., 27 W. 67 St., New York City.

Beatman, Augustus S., Julia Richman High School, New York City, 527 W. 121 St.

Beaumont, Jr., André Alden, New York University, New York City, 25 E. Ninth St.

Bechtel, Mary D., 3½-A Athens Ave., Ardmore, Pa.

Beck, B. W., State Teachers College, Kutztown, Pa.

Becker, Carl Lotus, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., 109 W. Upland Road.

Beebe, Dorothy L., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J., 276 Sixth Ave.
Belcher, Katherine F., Barringer High School, Newark, N. J.,
819 Grove St., Elizabeth, N. J.
Belt, J. Edward, William Penn High School, Harrisburg, Pa., 3039 Green St.
Bennett, Martha Crosby, Morris High School, New York City,
414 W. 121 St.
Bernstein, Samuel, DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City.
Berryman, Mrs. L. B., Stuart Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
235 First St., N. E.
Biemiller, Andrew J., 20 Rodney Dormitory, University of Pennsylvania,
Philadelphia, Pa.
Billingslea, John Smith, Upper Darby High School, Drexel Hill, Pa.,
4010 Huey Ave.
Birdsall, Jean, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Black, A. M., 318 W. 57 St., New York City
Blake, Julia E., Georgiancourt College, Lakewood, N. J.
Blom, E. William, High School, East Orange, N. J.,
156 Church St., Nutly, N. J.
Boring, Lydia T., West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
The Larchmont, 47 and Larchwood Aves.
Bosley, H. K., Western High School, Washington, D. C.,
1716 Kilbourne Pl., N. W.
Bowden, Witt, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.,
Wallingford, Pa.
Bowman, Daniel Hudson, McBurney School, New York City,
269 Academy St., Jersey City, N. J.
Boyce, Harriet L., High School, Passaic, N. J., 87 Prospect St.
Boyt, S. Ethel, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
210 Park Ave., Swarthmore, Pa.
Bradshaw, Bessie E., High School, Cambridge, Md., 109 Church St.
Brady, Mildred, High School, Fort Lee, N. J., 1041 Palisade Ave.,
Palisade, N. J.
Brainerd, Jessie J., Potomac (Private) School, Washington, D. C.,
2626 Garfield St.
Brant, Walther I., College of the City of New York, New York City,
6 Vassar Place, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Brebner, J. B., Columbia University, New York City.
Brewer, William M., 1010 Fairmont St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Bridgman, Anne T., Morris High School, New York City, 320 W. 83 St.
Brinker, Robert D., Stewart Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
1707 Massachusetts Ave.
Britten, Marion G., High School, Passaic, N. J., 5 Albion St.
Brockway, Thomas Parmelee, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.,
20 Valley Road.
Brooks, Rebecca B., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.,
2417 N. Calvert St.

Brown, Elizabeth Virginia, Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 2742 N. Charles St.
Brown, J. Franklin, Editor, The Macmillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City, 51 Ellenton Ave., New Rochelle, N. Y.
Brown, Louise Fargo, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Brown, Marshall Stewart, Dean of Faculties, New York University, New York City, 19 Fairview St., Yonkers, N. Y.
Brown, Stella E., Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 4213 Belmar Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Bryan, Alfred C., High School of Commerce, New York City, 416 Clermont Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Buchanan, Mary F., Junior No. 3 School, Trenton, N. J., 439 Bellevue Ave.
Buckle, Alice Isabel, High School, Conshohocken, Pa., 134 E. Fourth Ave.
Buckley, Margaret H., 5925 Falls Road, Mt. Washington, Baltimore, Md.
Bucknam, Kate D., Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 1417 Belmont St., N. W.
Bunnell, Theora J., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 3000 Connecticut Ave.
Burch, Henry Reed, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5208 Drexel Road.
Burlingame, Anne Elizabeth, Butler Hall, Hunter College, New York City, 88 Morningside Drive.
Butler, Mrs. Elva R., Preston, Caroline County, Md.
Buzby, Ethel, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3926 Locust St.
Bye, Edgar C., State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., 318 E. King St.
Byrom, Reba A., Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 501 Carpenter Lane, Germantown.
Cadogan, Margaret M., Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1518 Mt. Royal Ave.
Cairnes, Laura J., Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md., 4008 Roland Ave.
Calman, Alvin R., Upsala College, East Orange, N. J., 318 Prospect St.
Campbell, Elsie, High School, Morristown, N. J., 94 Western Ave.
Campbell, May B., Walton Junior High School, New York City, 2040 Seventh Ave.
Carman, Harry James, Columbia University, New York City, 21 Claremont Ave.
Carr, Charles F., High School, East Orange, N. J., 28 S. Walnut St.
Carr, Minnie Pearl, Cortland Normal School, Cortland, N. J., 52 Prospect Terrace.
Carrigan, Kathryn E. C., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J., 131 N. Richards Ave., Ventnor, N. J.
Carter, Alfred, George School, Bucks County, Pa.
Carver, Elizabeth Wright, Emalea Pusey Warner Junior High School, Wilmington, Del., Perryville, Md.

Caspari, Alice C., Junior High School No. 52, Baltimore, Md., 701 Lake Ave., Roland Park.
Cassell, Hannah F., High School, Chester, Pa., 1218 W. Seventh St.
Catherine, Sister Mary, Holy Trinity High School, Washington, D. C., 3513 D. St., N. W.
Challis, Miss C. E., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 331 Quackenbos St., N. W.
Chandor, Valentine L., Headmistress, Miss Chandor's School for Girls, 137 E. 62 St., New York City.
Cheronny, Helen E., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Cheyney, Edward Potts, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 259 S. 44 St.
Church, Clara B., 717 Rock Creek Church Rd., Washington, D. C.
Clark, Bessie S., Trenton Normal College, Trenton, N. J., 127 Academy St.
Clark, Chester Roy, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 1514 Columbia Road, N. W.
Clark, Florence R., Evander Childs High School, New York City, 2 Alden Place, Bronxville, N. Y.
Clark, Marion, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., Apt. 19, 1657 Lamont St., N. W.
Clark, Marion G., Director of Elementary Education, Montclair, N. J., 74 Montague Place.
Clark, Mary Emily, Principal, George Biddle High School, Cecilton, Md., Swan Harbor.
Clarke, Mary Patterson, Beaver College, Jenkintown, Pa.
Clauder, Anna Cornelia, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3334 N. Sixteenth St.
Cleaver, Clarence G., College Representative, Ginn and Company, New York City, 8426-110 St., Richmond Hill.
Cockram, Edith Mary, Junior High School No. 4, Trenton, N. J., 36 Prospect St.
Cohen, Edward M., Samuel J. Tilden High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Coleman, Kathryn F., 37 Riverside Drive, New York City.
Conner, Frances S., Central High School, Scranton, Pa., 2440 N. Washington Ave.
Connor, Dorothy B., 27 Coolidge Ave., White Plains, N. Y.
Conovitz, Michael, Central High School, Newark, N. J., 64 Monticello Ave.
Cooper, Caroline L., High School, Wilmington, Del., 1314 W. Seventh St.
Corlies, James A., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Cornelia, Mother Mary, Academy of the Holy Child, 3833 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Cornish, H. R., School No. 4, Paterson, N. J.
Coughlin, Mildred M., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 3823 Beech Ave.
Coulomb, Charles Augustin, District Superintendent, Board of Public Education, Philadelphia, Pa., 4249 Girard Ave.
Cowan, Helen, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Crall, F. Frank, High School, McKeesport, Pa., 1816 Willow St.
Crosby, Villa W., Roosevelt High School, Yonkers, N. Y., 50 Locust Hill Ave.
Curtin, Alice E., George Washington High School, New York City, 610 W. 116 St.
Curtis, Ann Gertrude, Walnut Hills High School, Cincinnati, Ohio, 2522 Bell Place.
Custer, John S., Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Dales, Frances E., High School, Passaic, N. J., 170 Broadway, Apt. D-8.
Dalgliesh, W. Harold, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.
Darby, Julian Paul, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 122 Spring Ave.
Dargo, Nathan, Seward Park High School, New York City, 742 Lafayette Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Davis, Mabelle E., High School, Passaic, N. J., 47 High St.
Dawson, Edgar, Hunter College, New York City, 55 E. 76 St.
Deane, Rev. Charles J., Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Fordham University, New York City.
Deck, Clara M., Senior High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., West Leesport, Pa.
Denison, Isabel Noyes, State Normal School, Potsdam, N. Y., 62 Elm St.
Deutsch, Arthur, Seward Park High School, New York City, 113 Grant Ave.
DeWald, Bertha E. C., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 22 Morris St.
Dickinson, Florence, Newtown High School, New York City, 118 Nineteenth St., Jackson Heights, Long Island, N. Y.
Dickson, Tenny V., 50 Morningside Drive, New York City.
Diehl, Vivian B., (Mrs. Frank), 2737 Maryland Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Dilks, Clara Gilbert, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6126 Jefferson St., West Philadelphia, Pa.
Donnally, Gay S., 2123 B. St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
Donovan, Lillian, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 2926 St. Paul St.
Dougherty, Philip, Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., 2 Windsor Road, Sudbrook Park, Md.
Dowd, Mary A., Box 6, University Station, Syracuse, N. Y., 505 S. Crouse Ave.
Downey, Margaret E., Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1575 Abbottston St.
Doyle, Anne, 3 Mitchell Place, New York City.
Doyle, John W., Abraham Lincoln High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 548-57 St.
Dragunas, William Joseph, Columbia University, New York City, 343 Menahan St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Dressner, Robert H., Jamaica Training School for Teachers, Jamaica, N. Y., 2710 Sedgwick Ave., Bronx, New York City.
Driscoll, Anna M., Andrew S. Draper Junior High School, New York City, 415 W. 115 St.
Duggan, Stephen P., Director, Institute of International Education, College of the City of New York, New York City, 2 W. 45 St.

Durkin, Helen E., (Mrs. J. E.), Seward Park High School, New York City.
Dwyer, Mary M., South Side High School, Bethlehem, Pa., 638 Fifth Ave.
Earle, Edward Mead, Barnard College, Columbia University,
New York City, 35 Claremont Ave.
Eckford, Mary Wright, 909 N. Tenth St., Columbus, Miss.
Eddy, Ruth M., Central Commercial and Manual Training High School,
Newark, N. J., 35 Morris Place, Hillside, N. J.
Eddy, William Woodbridge, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 321 Cattell St.
Elder, Jane, High School, Richmond Hill, New York City,
64 Gardens Apts., Forest Hills, N. Y.
Ellery, Eloise, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Elliott, Charles H., Commissioner of Education of New Jersey,
330 Lincoln Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.
Elliott, Rebecca Patton, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
5031 Cedar Ave.
Ellis, L. Ethan, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
Elsbree, Oliver W., Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., 124 S. Fourth St.
Elson, Henry W., New York University, Washington Square, East,
New York City, 1314 Watchung Ave., Plainfield, N. J.
Ely, Elizabeth L., Care of Rye National Bank, Rye,
Westchester County, N. Y.
Emery, Maude E., South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 102 Milford Ave.
Emmons, Grace R., Willard Hall School, Wilmington, Del.,
1222 Washington St.
Engelke, Mrs. Robert H., R. D. No. 2, Princeton, N. J.
Engle, Price B., Principal, Penn Treaty Junior High School,
Philadelphia, Pa., 4699 Castor Road.
Enk, John C., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J.,
45 N. Seventh Ave., Highland Park.
Eshleman, Willis S., High School, West New York, N. J.,
111-33 St., Woodcliff, N. J.
Espey, Emolyn C., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
1419 Crittenden St., N. W.
Evans, Austin P., Columbia University, New York City, Montrose, N. Y.
Evans, Jessie Campbell, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
650 S. Highland Ave., Merion, Pa.
Evans, Sara Field, (Mrs. H. C.), Willard Hall School, Wilmington, Del.,
709 Nottingham Road.
Ewer, Maidee S., Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
1141 New Hampshire Ave., N. W.
Fairchild, J. R., American Book Company, 88 Lexington Ave., New York City.
Falvey, Anna, High School, Richmond Hill, New York City, 8629-106 St.
Farnsworth, Mildred A., Junior High School No. 64, Manhattan,
New York City, 48 Bowne Ave., Flushing, N. Y.
Farnsworth, Nellie M., Junior High School No. 64, Manhattan,
New York City, 47 Bowne Ave., Flushing, N. Y.
Farrell, Letitia, 401 W. 118 St., New York City.

Farrington, Charlotte Raynsford, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 1623 Lanier Place, N. W.

Fay, Rev. Aloysius T., St. Joseph's College, Eighteenth and Thompson Sts., Philadelphia, Pa.

Fay, Harrison Gilbert, New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, 251 W. 74 St.

Feick, Mildred C., High School, Randallstown, Md., 4220 Hayward Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Fine, Harry B., Princeton Preparatory School, Princeton, N. J., 245 Nassau St.

Fiske, Lucy C., 553 West End Ave., New York City, 222 East 71 St.

Fleming, Carrie O., Julia Richman High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 450 E. 26 St.

Flick, Alexander Clarence, State Historian and Director of Archives and History, University of State of New York, State Education Bldg., Albany, N. Y., 127 South Manning Blvd.

Fontaine, E. Clarke, State Supervisor of High Schools of Maryland, 114 Water St., Chestertown, Md.

Foote, J. Wesley, Principal, John Barry Public School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1615 S. 59 St.

Forman, S. E., 3600 Albermarle St., Washington, D. C.

Fortenbaugh, Robert, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pa., 150 Broadway.

Fox, Dixon Ryan, Columbia University, New York City, Scarsdale, N. Y.

Fox, Ida M., Smallwood School, Baltimore, Md., 2222 N. Calvert St.

Freburger, Mary L., Gwynn's Falls Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 1908 Park Ave.

Freeman, Sara H., High School, Englewood, N. J., 121 Huguenot Ave.

Friedenthal, Mrs. Rush, 47 Claremont Ave., New York City.

Furlong, Rev. Philip J., Cathedral College, New York City, 462 Madison Ave.

Gambrill, J. Montgomery, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 548 Riverside Drive.

Gardner, Elizabeth, High School, Laurel, Md., 386 Mary St.

Garrett, Sara, Abraham Lincoln High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 324 E. 26 St.

Gemmill, Charlotte E., Thomas Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., College Club 1300 Spruce St.

Gibbons, Alice Newman, Director of Social Science Department, East High School, Rochester, N. Y., 287 Alexander St.

Gilbert, Amy M., Elmira College, Elmira, N. Y.

Gillepsie, Olivia, Proof Reader, D. Appleton and Company, New York City, 9 Miles Ave., White Plains, N. Y.

Giltner, Emmett E., New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, 85 Grant St., Yonkers, N. Y.

Gipson, Lawrence H., Lehigh University, Box 183, Bethlehem, Pa., Centre Valley, Pa.

Goldbloom, Simon, Samuel J. Tilden High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Golder, A., Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 3508 Fairview Ave.
Goldstone, Edwin G., Seward Park High School, New York City.
Golub, Jay, New Utrecht High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 7201 Ridge Blvd.
Goodman, Hannah, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1306 S. 53 St.
Goshow, Mildred, Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 428 Conarroe St., Roxborough.
Gottschalk, Joseph M., Frankford High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5032 Cedar Ave.
Grady, Mrs. Eleanor Hunsdon, Hunter College, New York City, 222 E. 71 St.
Graham, William, North East, Md.
Gray, Nomer, 155 W. 65 St., New York City, 304 Chestnut St., Roselle Park, N. J.
Greenan, John T., High School, East Orange, N. J., 312 N. Walnut St.
Greene, Evarts Bontell, Columbia University, New York City, 35 Claremont Ave.
Greene, Garton S., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Greene, W. Ainsworth, Newark Academy, Newark, N. J.
Greenfield, Kent Roberts, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., Tudor Arms Apts.
Greer, Roxy R., Jamaica Training School, Jamaica, N. Y., 106 W. Thirteenth St., New York City.
Griffith, M. Elizabeth, Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 82 North Carolina Ave., S. E.
Gross, Frank, Seward Park High School, New York City, 748 Jackson Ave.
Gwyder, Leona O'Connor, Jamaica Training School, Jamaica, N. Y., 83-69 Charlecote Ridge.
Haasz, George Neiler, South Philadelphia High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa., 1733 N. Sixth St.
Hale, Harriet F., Morris High School, New York City, 166 St. and Boston Road.
Hamel, Margaret B., High School, Swarthmore, Pa., 112 Princeton Ave.
Hamilton, Ruth Gertrude, Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Hanaway, Roy Clark, Warren College, New York City, 21 Crescent Ave., St. George, Staten Island.
Hanson, Daisy Evelyn, New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, 221 Egmont Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Harbold, Grace Ellen, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1820 Columbia Ave.
Harris, Suzanne P., 5601 Diamond St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Haslup, Alice E., Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 121 Thirteenth St., N. W.
Hatch, Roy Winthrop, State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J.
Hawkins, H. E., E. A. Paul Junior High School, Washington, D. C., The Chastlelon Apts., No. 127.
Hayes, Carlton J. H., Columbia University, New York City, 427 W. 117 St.

Hayes, Edward Maurice, High School, Stroudsburg, Pa., 619 Main St.
Hazen, Charles Downer, Columbia University, New York City, 42 E. 75 St.
Heald, Mark Mortimer, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., 185 N. Moore St., Princeton, N. J.
Heckel, Albert Kerr, Dean of Men, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., 7 Glenwood Ave.
Henderson, Marie E., High School, Plainfield, N. J., 309 E. Seventh St.
Herrick, Cheesman Abiah, President, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.
Hester, Laura Pywell, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Glencarlyn, Va.
Hickman, Emily, New Jersey College for Women, New Brunswick, N. J., 77 Nichol Ave.
Hill, Huntington, New York University, University Heights New York City, 2015 University Ave., Apt. 4-D.
Hodgdon, Frederick Crosby, Member of Firm of Ginn and Company, Educational Publishers, 70 Fifth Ave., New York City, 4 Gramercy Park.
Hodgdon, Mrs. Frederick Crosby, 4 Gramercy Park, New York City.
Hodgkins, George Wilson, Central High School, Washington, D. C., 1821 Kalorama Road.
Hoff, Marian Goddard, High School, Scarsdale, N. Y., Hotel Wentworth, New York City.
Hollenbach, Charles R., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.
Holloway, Catherine Virginia, Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 2707 Strathmore Ave., Hamilton.
Holt, Lucius Hudson, Colonel, United States Army, United States Military Academy, West Point, N. Y.
Hood, Raymond J., Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1321 Spruce St.
Hoss, A. K., Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 644 Massachusetts Ave., N. E.
Howard, Elizabeth I., School No. 89, Queens, Elmhurst, N. Y., 8605 Britton Ave.
Howard, Inez, E. A. Paul Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1702 Summit Pl., N. W.
Howe, Samuel Barnett, South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 33 Lehigh Ave.
Hubbard, Genevieve G., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 2032 Belmont Rd.
Hubbard, John T., High School, East Orange, N. J., 296 N. Walnut St.
Hughes, A. S., Stuart Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 426 Fourth St., N. E.
Hughes, Ray Osgood, Assistant Director in Charge of Social Studies, Public Schools, Pittsburgh, Pa., 5517 Beverly Place.
Hughes, Sara M., Vice Principal, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 7 Grandview Place.
Hull, Charles Henry, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., 413 E. Buffalo St.

Hull, William Isaac, Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., 504 Walnut Lane.
Humphrey, Martha K., Dwight School, Englewood, N. J.
Hunt, Erling M., Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City.
Hunt, L. J., Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C.,
1330 Belmont St., N. W.
Hunter, Marion A., High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 10 Eastman Terrace.
Hussong, Hazel, Simon Gratz High School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.,
603 Pearl St., Camden, N. J.
Huttman, Maude A., Barnard College, Columbia University, New York City,
308 W. 73 St.
Hyatt, Alton Rufus, Lawrenceville School, Lawrenceville, N. J.
Ironside, Charles Edward, Hunter College, New York City, 420 W. 119 St.
Ironside, Mrs. Katherine Bigley, 420 W. 119 St., New York City.
Irwin, Ray W., Washington Square College, Washington Square East,
New York City, 2322 Andrews Avenue.
Isanogle, Alvey Michael, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.,
Ridge Road at Westmoreland St.
Jacobs, Ethel A., West Side High School, Newark, N. J.,
120 Linden Ave., Bloomfield, N. J.
Jarrold, Rachel M., State Teachers College and Normal School,
Trenton, N. J., 514 E. State St.
Jenkins, Alice E., Technical High School, Scranton, Pa., 1513 Lafayette St.
Jewell, Marion D., Washington Irving High School, New York City,
1400 Dean St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Johnson, Henry, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City,
35 Knollwood Ave., Mamaroneck Knolls, N. Y.
Johnson, Lloyd Wellington, Principal, Adelphi Academy, Brooklyn, N. Y.,
75 Nassau Ave., Melverne, N. Y.
Johnston, Warren G., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
6917 Cottage St., Tacony.
Jones, Edith M., Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
206 S. Fifth St., Darby, Pa.
Jones, George J., Head of Department of History, Junior and Senior
High Schools, Washington, D. C., 3670 Park Place, N. W.
Jurkat, Frank Albert, Cedarville College, Cedarville, Ohio.
Kauffman, Rose M., Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4240 Pine St.
Kause, Selma, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C.,
3018 Porter St., N. W.
Kaye, P. Lewis, Baltimore City College, Baltimore, Md., 3410 Pinkney Road.
Kayser, Elmer Louis, George Washington University, Washington, D. C.,
2100 G. St.
Keffer, Mrs. Mary V., Westmont Upper-Yoder High School, Johnstown, Pa.,
520 Franklin St.
Keliher, Alice Virginia, Student, Columbia University, New York City,
Box 234, 1230 Amsterdam Ave.
Keller, Marie Louise, Haaren High School, New York City,
44 Woodruff Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Kelley, Frank B., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, 36 DeWitt Road.
Kelsey, Raynor W., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa., 753 College Ave.
Kennedy, Edna Ruth, Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 57 Gardner Ave.
Kimmel, W. G., Executive Secretary, Social Studies Investigation, 1004 Physics Bldg., Columbia University, New York City.
King, Mrs. Florence B., William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3622 Hamilton St.
Kinnear, Agnes I., Columbia Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1750 Sixteenth St., N. W.
Kirk, Byron, South Side High School, Newark, N. J., Eagle Rock Ave., Roseland, N. J.
Kirkman, Loulie Redus, Washington Irving High School, New York City, 257 W. Eleventh St.
Klinesmith, Bessie, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., Green Hall Apts.
Knapp, Annie M., High School, Richmond Hill, N. Y., 8438-113 St.
Knee, Pauline, Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 401 Pershing Drive, Clarendor, Va.
Kneeland, Edwin Leroy, High School, Ridgewood, N. J., 33 Park Place.
Knowlton, Daniel C., New York University, New York City, 97 N. Mountain Ave., Montclair, N. J.
Knox, Antoinette, High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 13 Randolph Ave.
Koch, Flora M., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 339 E. 58 St., New York City.
Kochka, Mary Murray, (Mrs. J. L.), Eastern High School, Washington, D. C., 1317 Farragut St., N. W.
Kojouharoff, Edith C., Central High School, Washington, D. C., Apt. 404, 1601 Argonne Place.
Kollock, Margaret R., West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1926 Spring Garden St.
Krout, John A., Columbia University, New York City, 10 Fountain Inn.
Kuhn, Olga, Seward Park High School, New York City, 3100 Broadway.
Kull, Irving Stoddard, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J., 203 Lincoln Ave.
Ladson, Gertrude L., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1458 Columbia Road, N. W., Apt. 306.
LaFollette, Robert, Ball Teachers College, Muncie, Indiana, 921 W. Charles St.
Lamborn, Anne, Stuart Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1884 Columbia Rd., Apt. 7.
Lamm, Lucian, Haaren High School, New York City, 2757 Claflin Ave., Bronx.
Lampert, Blanche L., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3427 Halstead Place, N. W.
Lamson, Elizabeth H., Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1715 Kilbourne Place, N. W.

Lane, Layle, James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 226 W. 150 St.
Lange, Mary V., Newtown High School, Elmhurst, L. I., N. Y., 202 Fremont St., Harrison, N. Y.
Langford, A. M., Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.
Langsam, Walter Consuelo, Columbia University, New York City, 310 Convent Ave.
Latané, Edith, Headmistress, St. Margaret's School, Tappahannock, Va.
Latané, John Holladay, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 210 Chancery Road, Roland Park.
Lavers, Lida A., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 105 S. Grove St., East Orange, N. J.
Lawrence, Antoinette, High School, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y., Whitman Hotel.
Lawrence, Mother Mary, Rosemont College, Rosemont, Pa.
Lawson, Leonard Axel, Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y., 101 St. Clair St.
Leary, Lois M., Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., 3433 Guilford Terrace.
Leary, Marion Beall, Principal Grammar School, Oakland, Md., 80 Center St.
Lee, Linette E., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 153 College Ave.
Leete, Gertrude M., Dean of Girls, High School, Richmond Hill, New York City, 9344 Hollis Court Blvd., Queen's Village, N. Y.
Leffler, Katherine, New York Training School for Teachers, New York City, 36 W. 93 St.
Leffler, Mary Letitia, High School, Perryville, Md., Locust Lane, Elkton, Md.
Leiwerling, Gretta V., Junior High School, Trenton, N. J., 2333 S. Broad St.
Leonard, Caroline W., High School, Bayonne, N. J., 100 W. 33 St.
Levinson, Florence, Forest Park High School, Baltimore, Md., 4025 Reisterstown Road.
Levy, Clara, State Normal School, Newark, N. J., 230 N. Sixth St.
Lewis, Ernest Dorman, Evander Childs High School, New York City, 120 E. 184 St.
Lewis, Sarah, New Utrecht High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 381 Argyle Road.
Lewis, William Dodge, Editor-in-chief, The John C. Winston Company, 1006 Arch St., Philadelphia, Pa., 38 E. Greenwood Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Lincoln, Anna T., Willard Hall School, Wilmington, Del., 721 Adams St.
Lindeman, Elizabeth, 638 E. 237 St., New York City.
Lingelbach, William E., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.
Lipsky, Leah, Seward Park High School, New York City, 749 E. 175 St.
Littell, Anna L., High School, Scotch Plains, N. J., Lock Box 244.
Lloyd, Amy G., David W. Harlan School, Wilmington, Del., Route 1, Box 137.
Lokke, Carl Lundwig, Furnald Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Long, Pauline Yates, E. A. Paul Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1333 Park Rd., N. W., Apt. 6.
Lonn, Ella, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md., 2320 N. Calvert St.
Lord, Eleanor L., Box 50, Rosemont, Pa.

Loreton, Joseph O., 46 Horatio St., New York City.
Loucks, Emerson H., State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., 30 N. Washington St.
Lowe, B. E., High School, Hackensack, N. J., 125 Lawrence Ave., Hasbrouck Heights, N. J.
Lucey, Anna M., Evander Childs High School, New York City, 34 Leighton Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.
Lucke, Elmira R., Lincoln School of Teachers College, New York City, 411 W. 116 St.
Lucas, Bertha L., Stuart Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 4009 Fourteenth St., N. W.
Ludington, Eleanor, Albany Academy for Girls, Albany, N. Y., 110 South Lake Avenue.
Lunt, W. E., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
Lutz, Paul E., Wilson Normal School, Washington, D. C.
Lynch, Jr., John H., 5845 Catherine St., Philadelphia, Pa.
Mace, William Harrison, Professor Emeritus and Author, 1125 Western Ave., Norfolk, Va.
MacGerrigle, Raymond Pronty, Princeton Preparatory School, Princeton, N. J.
MacIntosh, L. M., Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 821 North Carolina Avenue.
Mackey, Sarah E., 717 Arlington Ave., Plainfield, N. J.
MacLear, Anne Bush, Hunter College, New York City, 118 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Maloney, Emma J., Gordon Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Hotel Roosevelt, Apt. 525 16th and V Sts., N. W.
Manning, Frederick J., Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pa., 215 Roberts Road, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Marsh, Genevieve, McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 215 The Ontario.
Marshall, James F., Jamaica Training School for Teachers, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y., 3522 Ninetieth St., New York City.
Martin, Anna Kendall, George Washington High School, New York City, 650 W. 170 St.
Martin, Caroline P., Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1830 R. Street, N. W.
Martin, Mrs. Mabelle E., McKinley High School, Washington, D. C., 1627 Lamont St., N. W.
Marty, Sara M., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 45 Edgewood Ave., Larchmont, N. Y.
Masland, Marion Woodworth, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 1520 N. Fifteenth St.
Masterson, Rev. Peter V., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.
Matthews, Etta H., Langley Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 2001 Sixteenth St., N. W.

Matthews, Jr., William H., Reference Worker, New York Public Library, New York City, 600 W. 116 St.

McCarty, Cora, Business High School, Washington, D. C., 106 Hammond Court, Thirtieth and Q Sts., N. W.

McCauley, Alice, Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1354 Monroe Street, N. W.

McClain, Miriam, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

McClellan, Effie G., Technical High School, Scranton, Pa., 212 Pittston Ave.

McClosky, Mary Lee, Chattle High School, Long Branch, N. J., 129 Norwood Ave.

McCreary, Gertrude R., Liberty High School, Bethlehem, Pa., 728 N. High St.

McCulloch, Margaret C., 446 S. Centre St., Orange, N. J.

McGoldrick, Joseph D., Columbia University, New York City, 596 Madison St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

McGraw, Harold F., High School, Alfred, N. Y.

McGroarity, Mary Evangeline, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., Falls Church, Va.

McKee, Jr., Samuel, Hamilton Hall, Columbia University, New York City, 616 W. 116 St.

McKenzie, Isabel, Hunter College, New York City, 50 Curtis Place, Maplewood, N. J.

McKinley, Albert Edward, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 6901 Germantown Ave.

McMaster, Mrs. Virginia N., High School, Passaic, N. J., 39 High St.

McMaster, William Edwin, High School, Passaic, N. J., 39 High St.

McMurray, Donald LeCrone, Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., 210 McCartney St.

McNally, Lucille H., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

McNichol, Margaret H., West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 455 Harper Ave., Drexel Hill, Pa.

McQueen, Alice Edgerton, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6316 Sherman St., Germantown.

McQuilland, George T., Morris High School, New York City, 8501-94 St., Woodhaven, L. I., N. Y.

Mead, Nelson P., College of the City of New York, New York City, 81 Hillside Ave., Hastings-on-Hudson, N. Y.

Melchoir, D. Montford, Supervisor of High School Instruction, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Meng, Mabel Anna, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3767 N. Gratz St.

Messenger, Ruth E., 640 Riverside Drive, New York City.

Miller, Jr., Augustus Charles, The Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J., 49 W. Brittania St., Taunton, Mass.

Miller, Helen, Eastern High School, Baltimore, Md.

Miller, Margaret I., State Normal College, Trenton, N. J., 50 Atterbury Ave.

Miller, Mrs. Sarah D. Leeds, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4906 Knox St., Germantown.
Miner, Clarence E. Wentworth, Theodore Roosevelt High School, New York City, 619 W. 114 St.
Miner, Dwight Carroll, John Jay Hall, Columbia University, New York City.
Mitchell, Pearl Boring, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5016 Locust St.
Mohair, Anna B., Central High School, Newark, N. J., 10 Summit St., East Orange, N. J.
Mohr, Walter Harrison, George School, Bucks County, Pa.
Monacella, Sister M., Villa Maria College, W. Eighth St., Erie, Pa.
Monroe, Elsie Mae, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 154 W. Sharpnack St.
Moon, Parker Thomas, Columbia University, New York City, 29 Claremont Ave.
Moore, Emily E., Elkton High School, Elkton, Md., North East, Md.
Moore, Louise M., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 2905 Thirteenth St., N. W.
Moore, Myrtle E., Powell Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 11673 Park Rd., N. W., Apt. 43.
Moore, Olive, Research Assistant in Department of Education, Yale University, New Haven, Conn., 1217 Whitney Ave.
Morehouse, Frances, Hunter College, New York City, 414 W. 121 St.
Morley, Mrs. Caroline C., Shaw Junior High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1315 S. 53 St.
Morrissy, Elizabeth, College of Notre Dame, Md., 3107 St. Paul St., Baltimore, Md.
Mosier, Elwood, Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., 325 E. 22 St.
Moyer, Fayette E., DeWitt Clinton High School, New York City, 87 Grove St., Montclair, N. J.
Mudd, H. L., High School, Bayonne, N. J., 107 W. Eleventh St., New York City.
Mueller, Henry R., Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa., 230 N. Twentieth St.
Muhlfeld, Helen, Hunter College, New York City, 125 E. 164 St.
Munro, Dana Carleton, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Murphy, Joseph M., Columbia University, New York City, 2940 Broadway.
Murray, Dorothy, 106 Morningside Drive, New York City.
Murray, Lucy E., Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 2016 Park Ave.
Murray, Robert Cornelius, Senior-Master, Riverdale Country School, Riverdale-on-Hudson, N. Y., 2623 Sedgwick Ave., Kingsbridge, New York City.
Musser, John, Graduate School, New York University, New York City, 2087 Wiegand Place.
Muthard, William, High School, Coatesville, Pa., 600 E. Lincoln Highway.
Muzzey, David Saville, Columbia University, New York City, 492 Van Cortlandt Park Ave., Yonkers, N. Y.

Nelson, Mabel F., 115 W. Fifteenth St., New York City,
North Shore Hotel, Evanston, Ill.
Nettleton, Harriet A., Madison Junior High School, Newark, N. J.,
842 S. Fourteenth St.
Newcomb, Helen K., Central High School, Scranton, Pa., 302 Harrison Ave.
Nicholas, Florence Louise, High School, Nazareth, Pa., 201 S. Whitfield St.
Nichols, Roy F., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa., 108 S. 36 St.
Norman, Mrs. Julia T., Principal, Severna Park High School, Severna Park,
Md., 198 King George St., Annapolis, Md.
North, Lila V., High School, Montclair, N. J., 178 Summit Ave.,
Upper Montclair, N. J.
North, Mary, High School, Montclair, N. J., 4 Norman Road,
Upper Montclair, N. J.
Norwood, J. Nelson, Dean, Alfred College, Alfred, N. Y.
Noyes, Edmond S., Central High School, Washington, D. C., Kensington, Md.
Osborne, Helen S., Hubbard School, Plainfield, N. J., 111 E. Sixth St.
Osgood, Ellen L., Coördinator-in-charge, Bureau of Guidance and Placement,
106 E. 52 St., New York City.
Otis, Isaac L., Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md.
Ott, Mary Castle, Hood College, Frederick, Md., 19 Rosemont Ave.
Packard, Frederick L., High School, Montclair, N. J., 34 Oakwood Ave.,
Upper Montclair, N. J.
Palmer, Alice, James Monroe High School, New York City, 545 W. 164 St.
Palmer, Earle Schuyler, High School, Montclair, N. J., 14 Trinity Place.
Palmer, Rilla Wood, East Side High School, Newark, N. J.,
Hotel East Orange, East Orange, N. J.
Park, Joseph H., New York University, University Heights, New York City.
Park, Julian, University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., Niagara Square.
Parton, Dorothy M., Central High School, Washington, D. C.,
3926 Morrison St., Chevy Chase, D. C.
Patch, Ralph S., High School, Plainfield, N. J., 829 Osborn Ave.
Patton, Mary Propert, Public School No. 89, Queens, New York City,
83-27 St., Jackson Heights, L. I. N. Y.
Peardon, Thomas Preston, Barnard College, Columbia University,
New York City.
Peck, Beatrice, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa.,
4922 Chancellor St.
Peckham, Beulah A., West Orange High School, West Orange, N. J.,
40 S. Munn Ave., East Orange, N. J.
Penniman, Ralph Wentworth, Fosdick-Masten Park High School, Buffalo,
N. Y., 29 Knowlton Ave. Kenmore, N. Y.
Penny, Grace, Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C.
Phillips, Gladys Elizabeth, Principal, Elementary School, Hampstead, Md.,
417 Maryland Ave., Cambridge, Md.
Phillips, Jesse C., Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 718 S. 55 St.
Phinney, Mrs. Alexander Stewart, Associate Principal, The Knox School,
Cooperstown, N. Y., Pioneer St.

Pickett, Isabelle, Western High School, Washington, D. C., 2823-38 St., N. W.
Pielert, Mrs. Mabel A., Middle River, Baltimore County, Md.
Pius, Sister Mary, Mount St. Agnes College, Mt. Washington, Md.
Plate, Emma, Senior High School, Bayonne, N. J., 344 Highwood Ave., Leonia, N. J.
Poole, Martha S., Western High School, Washington, D. C., Hammond Court.
Powell, Ethel Jane, State Teachers College, Millersville, Pa.
Pratt, Julius W., University of Buffalo, Buffalo, N. Y., 65 Evans St., Williamsville, N. Y.
Prentice, Leigh Wells, Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5006 N. Erringer Place, Germantown.
Price, Blanche D., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 404 W. School Lane.
Price, Joseph Haines, Germantown Friends' School, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., 7435 Sprague St., Mt. Airy.
Priest, W. Edwin, Western High School, Washington, D. C.
Puig, Louise M., Manual Training High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1270 Carroll St.
Purcell, Richard J., Catholic University, Washington, D. C., 3202 Seventh St., N. E.
Quinlan, Grace M., Maxwell Training School for Teachers, Park Place, Brooklyn, N. Y., Park Place and Nostrand Ave.
Race, Marian N., High School, Passaic, N. J., 272 Lafayette Ave.
Rader, Sarah R., Newtown High School, Elmhurst, L. I., N. Y., 957 Fox St., Bronx, New York City.
Raetzer, Ernest Y., Senior High School, Trenton, N. J., 377 Hamilton Ave.
Ranck, James Byrne, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md., 42 Longwell Ave.
Ranft, Charles F., Polytechnic Institute, Baltimore, Md., Sudbrook Park, Md.
Rapeer, Yvonne, Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1721 Twenty-first St., N. W.
Raubenheimer, Otto, 1341 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Raymond, Irving W., Columbia College, Columbia University, New York City, 404 W. 115 St.
Reese, Lillian Berry, Lafayette Junior High School, No. 79, Baltimore, Md., 4103 Roland Ave.
Renninger, George Hansen, 317 E. Oakdale Ave., Glenside, Pa.
Renninger, Warren D., Central High School, Philadelphia, Pa.
Rexford, Frank A., Director of Civics and Civics Activities, Board of Education, New York City, 131 Livingston St.
Rice, Irene, Western High School, Washington, D. C., 1645-31 St.
Rice, Winfield L., Boys High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 400 Clinton Ave.
Richardson, Mary Woods, South Side High School, Memphis, Tenn., 1020 Rayner St.
Rigney, Sister Regina Mercedes, College Mount Saint Vincent-on-Hudson, New York.

Risley, A. W., New York State College for Teachers, Albany, N. Y., 455 State St.

Roberts, William Ely, West Philadelphia High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 207 McKinley Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.

Robinette, Rosalie A., Central High School, Washington, D. C., 111 Primrose St., Chevy Chase, Md.

Robinson, George B., Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., Livingston Apts.

Robinson, James Harvey, 173 Riverside Drive, New York City.

Rogers, Elizabeth Frances, Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.

Rogers, Winifrede, Western High School, Washington, D. C., Clarendon, Va.

Rolar, Erma K., Shippensburg State Teachers College, Shippensburg, Pa., 204 E. Garfield St.

Rooney, Hugh C., Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 550 W. 157 St., New York City.

Roorbach, Agnew O., William Penn High School, Harrisburg, Pa., 1815 Whitehall St.

Rosalie, Sister M., Marywood College, Scranton, Pa.

Rosett, Mrs. Louise Carey, Child Education Foundation Training School, New York City, 958 Madison Ave.

Roys, Abby Emery, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 2953 Boulevard.

Roys, Marion I., East Side High School, Newark, N. J., 22 Hillyer St., Orange, N. J.

Rubenstein, Jacob, Bay Ridge High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 41-A Hampton Place.

Rugg, Harold, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 76 Riverside Drive.

Rust, Louise B., 252 Lincoln Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.

Ryan, Rev. Thomas F., Dean, St. John's College, Brooklyn, N. Y., 75 Lewis Ave.

Ryden, George Herbert, University of Delaware, Newark, Del., 172 W. Main St.

Sachs, Julius, Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 225 W. 86 St.

Sackett, Hermon, State Teachers College of Edinboro, Edinboro, Pa.

Saurwalt, Alma Virginia, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 5415 N. Eleventh St.

Sayre, J. Frank, Seward Park High School, New York City, 3 Hawthorne Place, Montclair, N. J.

Schapiro, J. Salwyn, College of the City of New York, New York City, 254 W. Twelfth St.

Schlaerth, William J., Loyola College, Evergreen, Baltimore, Md.

Schmidt, Martha Virginia, High School for Girls, Reading, Pa., 1022 N. Fourth St.

Schuyler, Livingston Rowe, College of the City of New York, New York City, 520 W. 114 St.

Schuyler, Mary Eloise, Overbrook High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 4922 Chancellor St.

Schwab, William K., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J., 36 Van Mar Ave.

Schweppe, Emma, Director of Extension, State Normal School, Glassboro, N. J., 127 Grandview Ave.

Scott, Helen A., Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J.

Scott, Pauline, Business High School, Washington, D. C., 1517 Thirtieth St., N. W.

Sebring, Emma G., Principal, St. Agatha's School, 553-559 West End Ave., New York City, 165 W. 82 St.

Selecter, Rachel, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Shafer, Mary Catherine, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Pa., 111 N. Seventh St., Stroudsburg, Pa.

Shaffer, Louise, Maryland State Normal School, Frostburg, Md.

Shane, Minnie B., State Teachers College and Normal School, Trenton, N. J., 106 W. Welling Ave.

Shaughnessy, Margaret, 1433 Bolton St., Baltimore, Md.

Shearer, Augustus Hunt, Professional Lecturer, Grosvenor Library, Buffalo, N. Y., 197 Linwood Ave.

Shefloe, Joseph S., The MacMillan Company, 60 Fifth Ave., New York City, 2314 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.

Sheldon, Laura C., 233 S. Fulton Ave., Mt. Vernon, N. Y.

Shepherd, William R., Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University, New York City.

Shiels, Albert, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 509 W. 121 St.

Shipman, Henry Robinson, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 27 Mercer St.

Shotwell, James Thomson, Columbus University, New York City, Director of Division of Economics and History, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 257 W. 86 St.

Shower, Cecilia M., Manchester, Md.

Shryock, Richard Harrison, Duke University, Durham, N. C., 375 Green Lane, Roxborough, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sigman, James G., Director of Visual Education, City Schools of Philadelphia, Pa., 3300 N. Bouvier St.

Silversmith, Mrs. Minnie B., South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 6033 Pine St.

Simpson, I. Jewell, Assistant State Superintendent of Schools, State Department of Education, Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md., The Preston Apts., Preston St. and Guilford Ave.

Simpson, Sarah A., Board of Education, New York City, 401 W. 118 St.

Sioussat, St. George L., University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Skidmore, Flossie, Maryland State Normal School, Frostburg, Md., 24 Depot Terrace.
Skinner, Avery W., Director of Examinations and Inspections Division, New York State Department of Education, Albany, N. Y., 180 Washington Ave.
Skinner, Mabel, Washington Irving High School, New York City, 41 Fifth Ave.
Sloyer, Monroe W., Boy's High School, Lancaster, Pa.
Smith, Donald E., George Washington High School, New York City, 3885 Sedgwick Ave.
Smith, Edward P., Assistant, Examinations and Inspections Division, State Education Department, Albany, N. Y.
Smith, Jennie R., Junior High School, Kenmore, N. Y., 169 Nassau Road, Buffalo, N. Y.
Smith, J. A., E. A. Paul Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3115 Mt. Pleasant St.
Smith, Margaret Virginia, High School, Plainfield, N. J., 113 Duer St.
Smith, Marie C., 60 Van Ness Place, Newark, N. J.
Smith, Sherman M., Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y., 25 E. Pleasant St.
Smith, William Roy, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 140 Radnor Road.
Snowden, Sarah W., High School, Newburgh, N. Y., 238 Montgomery St.
Solliday, Helen, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 90 Morningside Drive, Apt. J-2.
Spencer, Helen M., E. A. Paul Junior High School, Washington, D. C.
Staples, Blanche L., Lincoln High School, Jersey City, N. J., 622 Bergen Ave.
Steele, Esther Clarkson Mayer, The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Stegmaier, Madeleine, Main St., Brookside, N. J.
Steichen, Elizabeth, Senior High School, New Brunswick, N. J., 275 Seaman St.
Steinberg, Samuel, Samuel J. Tilden High School, New York City, 2825 Claflin Ave., Bronx.
Stellwagon, George Heist, South Philadelphia High School for Boys, Philadelphia, Pa., 3736 Bonsall Ave., Drexel Hill.
Stern, Anna Louise, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., Sewell, N. J.
Stern, Bessie C., Maryland State Department of Education, Lexington Bldg., Baltimore, Md.
Stevenson, Helen G., South Side High School, Newark, N. J., 279 Mt. Prospect Ave.
Stewart, Mary, Jefferson Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 66 Virginia Ave., S. W.
Stewart, Mary Weldon, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 1218 S. Broad St.
St. John, Lois Barkey, Senior High School, Trenton, N. J., 108 Hoffman Ave.
Stoloff, Mrs. Rose C., Seward Park High School, New York City.

Stolzenberg, Bessie, Seward Park High School, New York City, 4 E. 107 St.
Stough, Mulford, Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., 210 S. West St.
Strauss, Percival S., Germantown High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 6012 Morton St., Germantown.
Strayer, Minnie H., Clifton Park Junior High School, Baltimore, Md., Hopkins Apts.
Streeper, Amanda, William Penn High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 632 N. Fortieth St.
Stryker, Clarence W., St. John's College, Annapolis, Md., 98 College Ave.
Stryker, Florence E., State Teachers College, Montclair, N. J., 10 Roosevelt Place.
Stube, Charles Frederick, State Normal School, Cortland, N. Y., 43 Church St.
Stutz, Clara K., Western High School, Washington, D. C., Hammond Court, 30 and Q Sts.
Stutz, Rose C., Western High School, Washington, D. C., Hammond Court, 30 and Q Sts.
Sullivan, James, Assistant Commissioner for Higher and Professional Education, University of State of New York, State Education Bldg., Albany, N. Y.
Sutch, Cleora, High School, Scarsdale, N. Y., 11 Church Lane.
Suter, Carl William, High School, Leonia, N. J., 222 Christie St.
Swain, James Edgar, Muhlenburg College, Allentown, Pa., 82 E. Stewart Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Sweeney, Edward A., Jamaica Training School for Teachers, Jamaica, L. I., N. Y., 4011 Eightieth St., Jackson Heights, N. Y.
Swetland, Roger Williams, Headmaster, The Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.
Talbot, Ruth, High School, Ridgewood, N. J.
Talcott, Mabel Hall, Norwich Free Academy, Norwich, Conn., 278 Washington St.
Tall, Lida Lee, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., Glen Esk.
Tanner, Edwin P., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y., 210 Walnut Place.
Taylor, Hazel, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 68 Harvey St., Germantown.
Taylor, Jane I., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 5 W. 124 St.
Teakle, Thomas, Lewis and Clark High School, Spokane, Washington, West 1508 Ninth Ave.
Tenrosen, Daniel, Julia Richman High School, New York City,. 672 Linden Blvd., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Textor, Lucy Elizabeth, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
Thomas, Bernadotte, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., 77 Stratford Ave., Lansdowne, Pa.
Thomas, Charles Marion, Long Island University, Long Island, N. Y., 300 Pearl St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Thomas, Harrison C., Richmond Hill High School, New York City, 46 Richards Road, Port Washington, N. Y.

Thompson, Eleanor, Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 4614 York Road.

Thompson, James Arthur, Singerly School, Philadelphia, Pa., 669 Brooklyn St.

Thompson, Mrs. M. Berna Hunt, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 22 Lexington Ave.

Thompson, Robert T., Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.

Thönssen, Ruby E., Gordon Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 3834 Garfield St.

Tibbetts, C. H., High School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 7 Grubb St.

Tieman, Elsie C., Care of Morgan and Company, 14 Place Vendôme, Paris, France.

Toner, Caroline E., Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1814 Ingleside Terrace, N. W.

Townsend, Caroline May, High School, Towson, Md., 3312 Westerwald Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Townsend, Mary Evelyn, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York City, 300 W. 109 St.

Treut, Alvina, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md.

Trimble, Helen Bell, State Teachers College, East Stroudsburg, Pa.

Tucker, Bethania, William L. Dickinson High School, Jersey City, N. J., 111 Garrison Ave.

Twaddell, Helen, Kensington High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 3620 Hamilton St.

Tyler, David B., Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

Underhill, Carolyn A., Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., Overbrook Court, Overbrook.

Valentine, Katherine, Hampstead Hill Junior High School No. 47, Baltimore, Md., 1120 N. Calvert St.

Van Bibber, Lena Chew, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., The Preston Apts., Preston St. and Guilford Ave., Baltimore, Md.

Van Dyke, Paul, The Graduate College, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.

Van Vleck, George W., Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1462 Glenwood Road.

Varley, Elsie D., Ossining School for Girls, Ossining, N. Y.

Vincent, John Martin, Professor Emeritus, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., 406 S. Holliston Ave., Pasadena, Cal.

Vliet, Andrew M., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 524 Alexandria Ave., Clarendon, Va.

Wagner, Hardesty Emory, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., 46 Park Place, Audobon, N. J.

Waidelich, Luther F., Northeast High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 360 N. Main St., Sellersville, Pa.

Waldo, Virginia, Miss Hockaday's School, Dallas, Texas.
Walker, Margaret W., Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 5050 Pulaski Ave. Frankford.
Walter, Ella C., Senior High School, Johnstown, Pa., 520 Franklin St.
Walther, E. Curt, Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., 715 Evesham Ave.
Walton, George A., Principal, George School, Bucks County, Pa.
Wanger, Ruth, South Philadelphia High School for Girls, Philadelphia, Pa., 833 W. Marshall St., Norristown, Pa.
Warren, Mrs. Florence L., 412 E. Fourth St., Wilmington, Del.
Waters, Suzanne Beatrice, Macfarland Junior High School, Washington, D.C., Apt. 301, 3300 Sixteenth St., N. W.
Weglein, David E., Superintendent of Schools, Madison and Lafayette Aves., Baltimore, Md., 2400 Linden Ave.
Weidenhammer, M. Antoinette, Western High School, Baltimore, Md., 213 S. Calhoun St.
Wells, Laura M., Supervisor, Intermediate Grades, Department of Education, Baltimore, Md., 4607 Edmondson Ave.
Wells, Mary B., Hartridge School, Plainfield, N. J., 1130 Thornton Ave.
Wendel, Hugo C. M., Long Island University, L. I., N. Y., 401 Eighth Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
West, Ruth, Lewis and Clark High School, Spokane, Wash., West 1207 Seventh Ave.
Westermann, William Linn, Columbia University, New York City, 23 Donellan Road, Scarsdale, N. Y.
Westfall, Ralph Raymond, Polytechnic Preparatory Country Day School, Brooklyn, N. Y., 8624 Ridge Blvd.
Whistler, Mrs. Mary Lee, 2712 Guilford Ave., Baltimore, Md.
White, Fred C., Morris High School, New York City, 470 E. 161 St.
White, Helen D., Germantown Friends' School, Philadelphia, Pa., 171 E. Walnut Lane, Germantown.
Whitney, Cornelia, J. O. Wilson Normal School, Washington, D. C., 672 Maryland Ave., N. E.
Whittier, Isabel M., Brooklyn College, Brooklyn, New York, 353 West 57 St.
Wiener, Katherine Marie, High School, Frederick, Md., 109 E. Patrick St.
Wilcox, Horace N., 465 Ocean Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wild, Estelle P., Columbia Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 333 Tenth Street, N. E.
Wilder, Charles W., Headmaster, The Arnold School, Pittsburgh, Pa., 7505 Rosemary St.
Wildes, Harry Emerson, Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Malvern, Pa.
Wildes, Mrs. Helen J., Simon Gratz High School, Philadelphia, Pa., Malvern, Pa.
Wildman, Catharine, High School, Langhorne, Pa., 305 N. Pine St.

Wildman, E. Theresa, Wm. Penn. High School, Philadelphia, Pa., 140 N. Fifteenth Street.

Wildman, Nathan, 2730 W. York St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Wilkenson, Katherine May, Miss Chapin's School, 100 East End Ave., New York City, 41 Central Park, West.

Willard, Eda G., Glassboro State Normal School, Glassboro, N. J., Evergreen Hall, Woodbury, N. J.

Williams, Mary Wihelmine, Goucher College, Baltimore, Maryland, 2435 N. Charles St.

Williamson, Mrs. Louise S., Wilson Ave. School, Newark, N. J., 615 Bangs Ave., Asbury Park, N. J.

Willis, Margaret, Constantinople Woman's College, Galata P. O., Box 39, Constantinople, Turkey.

Wilson, Ida Belle, Maryland State Normal School, Salisbury, Md.

Wilson, Martin L., James Monroe High School, Bronx, New York City, 217 Third St., Ridgefield Park, N. J.

Wing, Lucy Madeira, (Mrs. David L.) Headmistress, Miss Madeira's School, 1330 Nineteenth St., N. W., Washington, D. C.

Winston, Adele W., Morris High School, New York City, 3647 Broadway.

Winters, Herbert D., Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.

Witmer, M. Eleta, Senior High School, Atlantic City, N. J., Barclay Court, S. Pennsylvania Ave.

Wlodeck, Alwina H., Walton High School, New York City, 953 Anderson Ave.

Wolf, Morris, Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., 47 Sunshine Road, Upper Darby, Delaware Co., Pa.

Wolff, Mabel P., The Summit School, St. Paul, Minn., 1248 Lincoln Ave.

Wombaugh, Jennie R., High School, Olean, N. Y., 215 N. First St.

Wood, Della E., Radnor High School, Wayne, Pa., 5416 Sansom St., Philadelphia, Pa.

Wood, Elizabeth C., Wadleigh High School, New York City, 100 Morningside Drive.

Wood, Laura L., Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y., 432 Buffalo Ave., Paterson, N. J.

Woodward, Esther Rittenhouse, Hine Junior High School, Washington, D. C., 1915 Sixteenth St., N. W.

Woodworth, Allegra, The Shipley School, Bryn Mawr, Pa., 1106 County Line Road.

Woodworth, Carlos Anderson, Principal, High School, West New York, N. J., 24 Monitor Place.

Worstell, Helen S., DeWitt Clinton High School, Annex, New York City, 121 E. 51 St.

Worthington, Anna Lee, The Berkeley Institute, 181 Lincoln Place, Brooklyn, N. Y., 915 Post Hall, 510 State Street.

Wyckoff, Harriet Elvira, High School of Commerce, New York City, 512 W. 123 St.

Xavier, Sister Mary, Mount Saint Agnes College, Mt. Washington, Md.
Young, Helen L., Hunter College, New York City, 30 Cottage Ave., Mount Vernon, N. Y.
Young, Julia A., Grover Cleveland School, Washington, D. C., 1911 Third St., N. W.
Young, Malcolm M., McKinley Technical High School, Washington, D. C., 1819 F. St., N. W.
Zema, Demetrius B., Graduate School, Fordham University, Bronx, New York City.
Zimmerman, M. U., Rising Sun, Md.

Readings and Workbooks for the Modern Civics Course

HILL'S Community and Vocational Civics needs no introduction. Thousands of teachers already know it, and use it, as the outstanding textbook in its field. These teachers and all others who believe in the modern, vitalized civics program will welcome the news that Readings and Workbooks are now available for use with the Hill textbooks, or with other books of similar scope. This new material makes it practicable for every course in civics to include the wide outside reading and the varied pupil activities so strongly advocated by modern educators.

The Hill Civics Program

Community and Vocational Civics (Also available in two parts)	**$1.92**
Readings in Community Life	**$1.80**
Readings in Vocational Life	**$1.80**
My Community (a workbook)	**$0.64**
My Occupation (a workbook)	**$0.80**

GINN AND COMPANY

70 Fifth Avenue, New York